

3880. Also, petition of 270 citizens of Glenwood, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3881. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Herman Moelling and 60 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3882. Also, petition of C. Engle and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3883. Also, petition of the United Electric Supply Co. and signed by 24 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3884. Also, petition of Jacob B. Scott and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3885. Also, petition of Ted Sydow and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3886. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Anna Fisher and others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3887. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the executive secretary of the Michigan State Council of Brewery Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3888. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of seven representatives of the Christian churches, of Xenia, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3889. Also, petition of 124 residents of Springfield, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3890. By Mr. HART: Petition of 103 Americans citizens, residents of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, a prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3891. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the board of governors of the Maine Society of Public Accountants, Ernest M. Shapiro, of Lewiston, Maine, president, urging Congress to establish a qualified nonpartisan commission composed of Members of Congress, representatives of the Treasury Department, and independent lawyers, accountants, and economists to write a simple revenue law which will express a permanent and consistent policy of Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3892. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary of the Kentucky Aeronautics Commission, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3893. Also, petition of the clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Kern, State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of Senate bill 1257 and House bill 3018; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose hand is on the destiny of this world, let our prayer before Thee be as incense in adoration and praise. O how great is Thy goodness which Thou hast laid up for them that fear Thee and put their trust in Thee before the sons of men. May it be said unto them who are of a fearful heart, be strong, behold our God will come and save you.

Heavenly Father, with solemn earnestness we pray that our souls may be free of the horrors of hate; a good man carries heaven with him and Thy strength ennobles him. Each day let us contemplate with breathless responsibility the far-reaching influence of our labors. Grant that the disciples of our Lord may inspire us; they were wisest when lowliest and least conscious of their attainments. O guard us against self-aggrandizement and clothe us with that spiritual wealth and power which spring out of thoughts divine. Help us to rise above temper and tempest and crown us with a multiplied sense of courage and faith; let the unworried petition breathe forth from every breast. Set Thy will, dear Lord, to resist those who go on in sin and disobedience and are seeking to turn out the lights which illuminate the pathway to a world of peace and cooperation. O deliver this sin-stricken earth from the pestilence that walketh in darkness and from the destruction that wasteth at noonday and Thine shall be the glory forever, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 3, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Justice.
Department of the Navy.
Executive Office of the President (National Resources Planning Board).
Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission, N. Y. A.).
The National Archives.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARK-

LEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Executive Office of the President (War Production Board).
Executive Office of the President (Office of Price Administration).
Federal Security Agency.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress, regardless of party affiliation, I am sure, is anxious to give full justice to the men who have been members of the fighting forces. Six hundred thousand men and women have already been mustered out of the service with honorable discharges. Some have been obliged to endure extreme hardships because they left the service practically penniless. They require a cash payment at the time of their discharge.

Congress, I am sure, will do the right thing by the veterans and I rise to urge that it be done when the need is great. The time to do it is now if we are to give justice to all. I hope the committee will report the bill this week and that we can have it a law before Christmas. We could not do anything better to strengthen the morale of the fighting men and the people of the Nation. We, of course, will have a full program later to meet the needs of the veterans. The committee members have been working diligently for months upon this legislation, and they deserve full credit; but, I repeat, let us meet at once the particular need of a cash payment upon discharge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. He has touched on an important matter which confronts every veteran upon his discharge and will confront such veterans in the future.

We are all hopeful that early action may be taken. We all realize that the committee to which the bill has been referred has a large number of bills before it. We are hopeful that the committee will hold hearings as quickly as possible so that legislation will be passed that will provide for the mustering-out compensation for these veterans. It will be of invaluable assistance to veterans discharged in the past and particularly those in the future and will be of equally great assistance to society in the

quick readjustment of these men to civilian life.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If Members of the House will sign petition No. 8 which the veterans' organizations are asking for to concentrate this legislation in the hands of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, this legislation will be taken up without delay.

TO ELIMINATE PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an article written by Daniel J. Tobin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE ROGER M. CALLOWAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing on of Roger Calloway, formerly of the State of Wyoming, one of the reading clerks of the House. Mr. Calloway served in that capacity for nearly 5 years industriously, energetically, and ably. His friends were numbered by his acquaintances. I do not believe that he had an enemy. I never, in all of the time that I have known him, heard him utter a word against anyone. He was a lovable, fine gentleman. He was my friend and I was his friend. He will be missed by all of us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial recently published by the retail grocers of California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ROOSEVELT-CHURCHILL-STALIN CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce to the House that the Chair has in hand a copy of a statement made by Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, which will be released at 1 o'clock. Immediately thereafter, without objection, the Chair will lay the message before the House.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and

to include therein a dinner program of the Furlough Club, at Endicott, N. Y., and also an address by Mr. Ray Youmans, master of ceremonies, together with an address of my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other special orders today the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

WAR SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REGISTRATION OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN COMPANIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a companion bill to Senate bill 1476 introduced into the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I am doing this, of course, after having fully consulted with the Senator from Wyoming about my intended action.

This bill is, in my judgment, one of the most important and timely measures ever introduced in the United States Congress, and I believe that the Senator from Wyoming has performed an outstanding service in preparing it for introduction. The bill's purpose is to protect our country against the menace of the international cartel which has proven so great an obstacle to full production of necessary war equipment, as well as to the effective development of America's productive capacity in peacetime.

The measure would require domestic and foreign companies doing business in the United States to register with the Attorney General copies of any foreign contracts in which they or their affiliate companies participate whenever any such

contract contains any of the following provisions: First, restriction of production, sale, use, lease, or purchase of any articles of commerce; second, artificial fixing of prices; third, restriction of marketing territory; fourth, provision for the formation or use of any corporation for joint operations; or fifth, regulation or provision for the use of domestic or foreign patents or trade-marks. All such contracts would be open for public inspection.

This bill in other words, Mr. Speaker, is aimed to make the facts regarding international cartels known to the American people before, not after, they have done their damaging work. The international cartel amounts in effect to a secret treaty entered into not by governments but by private monopolistic corporations and we ought by this time to know very well how effective such cartels can be in profoundly altering the relative military strength of different nations, controlling and throttling both international trade and domestic production, and in exacting from the people extortionate prices for products which under competitive conditions would be produced in abundance and sold at reasonable prices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an article with reference to the price of corn, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on the subject of the price of cotton cloth in China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two separate instances and to include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therein an editorial from the Ft. Worth Star Telegram on soldier vote problems, and also to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an editorial by Raymond Brooks, Boston, appearing in the Austin Statesman, on the proposition of States' rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record on the subject Blueprints of a Lasting Peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

BLUEPRINTS OF A LASTING PEACE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on this date and at this particular stage of our participation in World War No. 2, although I anticipate a long, hard road ahead, I have no doubts of ultimate victory for the Allied cause. That victory must be unconditional surrender of the Axis powers and their satellites. Now, ever since I became a Member of Congress in January 1937, I have given most of my thoughts and energy to promoting our national defense, as war clouds loomed on the horizon and troubled world conditions became more ominous. Of course, since the outbreak of this war I have given most of my thought and energy to all legislative steps necessary to carry it on successfully.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I feel that—while fighting through—the time has come to give thought to what must follow. Accordingly I have been reading and studying many proposals for plans and blueprints of a lasting peace. Some of these are speeches by eminent jurists, university presidents, diplomats, military leaders, and well-known scientific men. Proposals range all the way from such scholarly discourse of President Hutchins and the guarded language of Sumner Welles to the scientific planning of Ely Culbertson.

Some of these leaders in post-war planning offer high idealism and propose an organization of the united states of the world with our own country playing the leading, beneficent part. Others propose a stern peace enforced as a Pax Americana, if necessary, by the superior armed force of the United States of America. In the midst of all this discussion I am slowly crystallizing my own thought in regard to this most vital of all issues.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY
PROPAGANDA

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to restrain my anger and to state just exactly what I think about a certain statement released by the War Relocation Authority, Columbus, Ohio, relative to the inducement of Japanese labor to come to Ohio and Michigan and live on our farms.

I want to give just two quotations from that Midwest Frontier, the publication referred to.

One of them is as follows:

Believe it or not, some few tenants and seasonal workers (in Ohio and Michigan) do not bathe. They think it is unhealthy. We

need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.

The other quotation is as follows:

We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West—in Ohio and Michigan—who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellow men and much for our sense of the art of agriculture, as well as the science.

Mr. Speaker, a single county in the Fifth District has probably more bath-tubs than the whole Japanese Empire. We have no such people, unless they are those moved in from other areas. When one remembers the old and infirm who have joined the young and the strong to feed such people as Mr. Dakan and Mr. Weiss, and have maintained Mr. Dakan on the State pay roll for years—no, Mr. Speaker, we are not ready to come to soaking a whole village in one pit—men and women indiscriminately.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, December 13, at the completion of all legislative business of the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LaFOLLETTE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

AID TO DISCHARGED SOLDIERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have a matter that we cannot turn our faces away from and that is to provide an immediate cash payment for those discharged from the armed forces. Men of World War No. 1 at the time of discharge from the armed services were given \$60. No law of this kind has been enacted for the men of World War No. 2. It is only human and only decent to do this and especially as our war industries are closing down. These men will go home and cannot get jobs. In my own city of Lowell, Mass., 7,500 people have been thrown out of work on account of a munitions plant closing down. Veterans will not be able to secure employment. Many of the women working in that plant are widows and will have no money coming in. Many of these widows have sons or daughters in the service.

Mr. Speaker, unless these veterans can have money to tide them over, they will be in a very sorry situation. Medicine is not an exact science. Many of these men who are supposed to be suffering from some sort of nerve exhaustion will be found later to be suffering from

more serious disabilities which will last for some time.

Many of these cases have not been given service connection for nervousness. Many have not been rated at all.

I do not believe there will be a single vote against a cash payment for the veterans and I hope this measure will be passed before Christmas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article and also a clipping from one of the bureaucratic publications entitled "Midwest Frontier." I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this indicates the depth of intellectual depravity to which some bureaucratic writers sink.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of contract termination and to include copy of an address I made on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Daily American, of West Frankfort, Ill., dated Wednesday, December 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Wayne County News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution of the St. Louis County Bankers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, regarding W. R. A.'s publication *Midwest Frontiers*, I believe that any farmer or anyone else who has been able to even keep his head above the offal which has been scattered throughout the Middle West during the past 10 years by the master spreaders in Washington should receive a medal and should not be accused of being unsanitary.

The Ohio farmer knows how and has been able to cope with ordinary sanitation problems but this 10-year deluge is something new and more putrescent, probably diaphoretic.

We middle westerners may not be the most sanitary people on earth, but we do know that when something begins to smell too much, it is rotten and should be buried.

We have reached that conclusion regarding the present putrescent "new stealers" and the interment will be held in November 1944.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain quotations with reference to the Japanese bath story.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FARM PRICES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of my very fine farmers has sent me a letter in which he said:

Last winter we sold our cows that were through as milkers, and our steers, for 12 cents per pound alive and 25 cents dressed. Now Farmer Peets pays 4 to 7 cents for such animals and we can't sell dressed beef at all. I paid \$9.10 for a Co-op tractor axle in 1942, now the bill is \$16.50. Chickens are selling at 16 cents per pound in Chesoning and 39 cents per pound in Saginaw, which gives 23 cents to someone. You know, Mr. Crawford, that such conditions are impossible to bear. We have sold all our sows, and pigs can be bought for 50 cents each, and dairy calves must be killed at 2 days to avoid losing \$10 worth of milk.

CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the action of the O. P. A. in raising the price of corn from \$1.07 to \$1.16 per bushel is typical of the bungling, muddling, and inefficiency of the Office of Price Administration and amounts to just another gesture and is too little and too late. For more than 6 months I have been urging the O. P. A. to either substantially increase the ceiling price on corn or remove it entirely. I even voted against a summer recess as a protest against the delay of the O. P. A. in acting to place a ceiling price on corn where it would start corn moving from the Middle Western States to eastern poultrymen and dairymen. Our dairy and poultry industry in the East is in a critical situation and each month is getting worse. Farms are being abandoned, herds disposed of, and production cut at a time when the country needs greater production in milk and eggs as a contribution to the war effort. I do not believe the action of the O. P. A. will help the farmers of the East or bring them any corn. The ceiling price should have been removed entirely or set at not less than \$1.25 per bushel and possibly at \$1.35. What the dairymen and poultrymen in the East want is corn and they are willing to pay the price, but if they cannot get it it will mean ruin and destruction for many of them. Two of my distinguished constituents who are dirt farmers have already been forced by O. P. A. bureaucratic exactions and regimentations to change their farm labels from dirt farmers—Franklin D. Roosevelt to a producer and distributor of Christmas trees and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., to a horticulturist and picker of apples.

REHABILITATION OF VETERANS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a radio address delivered by Mr. Ray Henle in connection with the violation of the censorship agreement by Reuters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SNIPING

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, former Governor Landon has reached a new political low in his remarks of last Saturday which appeared in the press.

During the past 4 years, in fact, almost since President Roosevelt defeated him in 1936, he has been nothing but an unfair critic of everything the President has done. His tactics have been to engage in cheap political sniping, the type of political tactics that one hardly expects from a man who was once honored by the Republican Party as the nominee for President.

Former Governor Landon seems to have adopted the role of being the front man for those who are trying to smear President Roosevelt.

In the past he has confined himself pretty much to domestic affairs, but last Saturday he extended his sniping efforts to our foreign policy. Mr. Landon was in the ranks of the isolationists before Pearl Harbor. If a majority of the Members of Congress had followed his position of opposition, when Pearl Harbor happened, our country would have been defenseless and unable to carry on the war. The only course we could have taken would have been to make the best terms we could with Nazi Germany and the Japs, and anyone with common sense knows what those terms would have been. Mr. Landon was wrong then and he is still wrong.

One thing is certain. Under the courageous leadership of President Roosevelt we are winning the war—and we will also win the peace.

It is about time the people of our country realize just what is going on, misstatements and false statements being made for purely political purposes, the only result of which can be to divide our people, and an attempt from a political angle to impair the prestige of President Roosevelt. This is a dangerous role to play in wartime.

When men like Governor Landon make unfair and unjustifiable statements, the people should remember his pre-Pearl Harbor record of isolationism.

Constructive criticism is one thing. Mr. Landon's negative criticism and sniping tactics are another thing.

Mr. Landon was so far wrong before Pearl Harbor on legislation concerning the very future and existence of our country, that he ought to be so ashamed of his poor vision and unsound judgment to remain silent on matters concerning the war, and to cease opposition for purely political reasons. He should let President Roosevelt, whose judgment was correct, and under whose leadership the war is being conducted successfully, conduct it to a successful conclusion, without being exposed to the type of unfair opposition that Mr. Landon represents.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have an estimate of the cost of inserting in the RECORD an address by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes before the American Petroleum Institute and also an address by Mr. Ralph K. Davies before the same institute. The cost of one is \$112.50 and of the other \$120. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include these addresses if they have not already been inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that it has already been done but that can be investigated. Without objection, they may be inserted in the RECORD if that has not already been done.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial and a resolution pertaining to the question of silver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES AND WORLD PROTEST SHOCKING ARREST OF STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD concerning the mass arrest of Norwegian students at Oslo University in Norway, and include therein an article of news of Norway by the Norwegian Ambassador.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 29, referring to gasoline which had been given to various union organizers, I made the statement:

These union organizers, so-called—some of them convicted criminals—have been getting all the gasoline they need to drive from Grand Rapids to Holland.

This morning I received a letter saying the union organizers had never been convicted of any criminal offense. I desire to correct the RECORD by striking out "some of them convicted criminals." I want to let the matter referring to the

union organizers who drove from Detroit to Port Huron, and the part that shows a list of their convictions, stand; but with reference to those who drove from Grand Rapids to Holland, Mich., I want to strike that out, as I accept the statement of Mr. Thomas Ward, an attorney whom I know personally, who wrote in their behalf, that such statement was not accurate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no authority to speak for Mr. Landon. I do not believe I ever met the gentleman. I think I remember having voted for him on one occasion, but I am sure he will appreciate the advice of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Might I add, too, that if Mr. Landon was mistaken, there were a great many of us in this country who were mistaken about the situation and perhaps our mistake or our misinformation, if it was that, is due to the fact that we were told all the time there was not going to be any war in which we would be involved and no one would be sent across the sea. If that was true, of course, we did not need conscription. I understand from a publication recently sent out by the State Department, the administration knew all about an attack about to be made on Pearl Harbor and what happened just before, but they did not do anything about it. They let it come and the people there were surprised, our people were killed, and our ships destroyed. Now, is it due to the fact they did not actually have the information? Can you charge it is due to those of us who wanted to keep out of this war and who relied on the statements of Members on the majority side and statements of those who told us they were speaking for the administration?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I introduced into the House, House Joint Resolution 199, which provides an extension of time for the court martialing or punishment of any or all persons, military or civilian, who were derelict in their duty at Pearl Harbor or in connection with that catastrophe. As Members of the House know, the press has intimated that both General Short and Admiral Kimmel have expressed willingness to waive the statute

of limitations which expires tomorrow. There is a serious question in the minds of many able lawyers whether or not they, or any Department concerned, have the authority to waive in advance of its operation the statute of limitations. My resolution is a plain and simple one. It simply extends the time for court martialing or punishment of any or all persons in military or civilian capacity up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially ratified by the Senate of the United States. In fairness to the House I want to say this resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Unfortunately there is not a quorum of the Committee on Military Affairs in the city, because some of the members have gone home and others are on official trips of inspection. But I talked less than an hour ago to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who is wholeheartedly in favor of this joint resolution. Many Members, both of the Senate and of the House, Democrats and Republicans alike, have expressed willingness to see it pass immediately, and it must be passed today or not later than tomorrow if it is to be effective. No one has expressed opposition to it. Therefore I am asking unanimous consent to take up House Joint Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would rather that the gentleman wait until the call of the Consent Calendar. Certainly the gentleman will be recognized at that time to make a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the Chair very much.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Michigan just now. What is he doing? Is he trying to have an alibi about something? O Mr. Speaker, I remember that just 2 months before Pearl Harbor the gentleman from Michigan and others voted against the extension of the draft. The gentleman from Michigan and those on that side of the House had every opportunity to know what was happening in the world, but because of pure partisanship they blinded their eyes as they are doing now, and as Mr. Landon is doing at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal of criticism now about the way veterans are being treated—especially by individuals who have done the least for them.

I notice that some men who voted against my amendment raising the base pay of the men in the service to \$50 a month, are now contending that there is an unholy combination between northern Republicans and southern Democrats, because we refuse to violate the Constitution of the United States, set up a Federal election commission in violation of the laws of every State in the Union, and wreck the election machinery of the whole Nation.

What we are trying to do is to give men in our armed forces the right to vote for everything, from President down, give them all the help they need to get these ballots to them and back, including free air-mail service, but to leave the election machinery in the hands of the States.

If the substitute passed by the Senate is adopted by the House it will do that very thing.

DISABLED VETERANS

Now as to the disabled veterans, we have been trying in every way we could—I am speaking of members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation—every single one of them, Democrats and Republicans, to bring out legislation that would take care of these disabled men who are being discharged.

We have a petition in the Well of the House now, petition No. 8, to amend the rules so as to concentrate this legislation in the hands of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

I now invite each and every Member of the House to sign that petition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter received from Mr. C. W. Kitchen, Deputy Administrator of the Food Distribution Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in attempting to defend the statement of Mr. Landon says that we were advised of the danger of an attack upon Pearl Harbor and did nothing about it. I would like to remind the gentleman that the President of the United States, as far back as May 1940, called our attention to the serious condition of world affairs and asked for money to strengthen the Army and the Navy. I recall, also, that he appointed two prominent Republicans, one as Secretary of War and one as Secretary of the Navy. If the

Army and the Navy were not prepared for Pearl Harbor you cannot charge it to the Democrats, because those two agencies were headed by Republicans, and they know what was coming if anybody knew. So let us keep the record straight. Mr. Landon ought to keep quiet about foreign affairs, because his advice, if we had followed it, would have led us into a situation much worse than the present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has expired.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2976, to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate, the Superintendent and all other members of the Navy Nurse Corps entitled under existing laws to relative rank shall have and shall be designated by the rank which corresponds to the relative rank heretofore provided by law for such Superintendent and members.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act contained shall alter, enlarge, or modify the provisions of law relating to the authority of such members of the Navy Nurse Corps, or to the manner of their appointment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDS IN CONNECTION WITH WAR MINERALS RELIEF

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2616, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards under the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the war minerals relief statutes", approved May 18, 1936 (49 Stat. 1355), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$54,775.82, in addition to the sum authorized by such act of May 18, 1936.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 166, to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was before the House last Consent Calendar day, I discussed it at length, and then asked that the bill go over without prejudice, in order that I might consult with the Attorney General. I sent the Attorney General a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained the debate, urged him to read it, and I asked him what the Department desired to do with reference to the legislation. I have a reply from him.

The letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1943.
Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Accounts,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As requested in your letter of November 15, 1943, I have examined the debate on House Joint Resolution 166, appearing on pages 9537-9538 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

You are correct in your statement as to the general policy with regard to gratuity offsets and also in your belief that if the resolution becomes a law and the Menominee Indians do not prevail in other suits now pending in the Court of Claims, the United States might lose the opportunity of asserting its gratuity offsets.

When the matter was submitted to this Department, this possibility was considered. The need of restoring the land to the reservation seemed important from an administrative standpoint, however, and seemed to counterbalance the possibility of losing the opportunity of asserting these offsets, especially as there are a number of other claims and the offsets can be used against any of them. For these reasons this Department did not object to the substantive purpose of the resolution but did suggest amendments which are intended to leave no doubt that the offsets will be available to assert against recoveries in the other suits, if any, and also against the present judgment for the value of the swamp lands in case the plan of acquiring those lands should not be effected. These amendments have been accepted by the Committee on Indian Affairs and have been included in the bill reported by the committee.

Because of the special circumstances surrounding this case, I have no objection to the bill as amended by the committee.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. COCHRAN. You will note that the Attorney General agrees with everything I said on the floor of the House. He then goes on to state, "When the matter was submitted to this Department this possibility was considered." He says

there is a situation that required the Attorney General to suggest certain amendments to the committee, and that the committee, having accepted the amendments, he is now in favor of the passage of the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to object to this bill, but I want it distinctly understood that with reference to offsets the passage of this bill by no means sets a precedent that I propose to recognize. I want that remembered. This is the first time that the Attorney General has agreed to eliminate offsets, and he is going on the assumption, and I said it was an assumption, that the Menominees are going to win another of their cases, and then we could recover as offsets our advances to those Indians.

Of course, if the Indians lose their other cases then we are out of luck as well as money.

The bill does provide the Government will have the power to offset any other claim by charging off gratuities.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman insists that offsets be counted in, and I assure him that it is my understanding that this bill does not waive the general policy of offsets, as the gentleman has always advocated it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know it does not, and I know it is not going to do it as far as I am concerned with any kind of a bill. As far as I am concerned, and I know I am only one Member of this House, if this bill does pass and it goes to the Senate, and objectionable amendments are added to the bill in the Senate, I will oppose it when it comes back to the House. The general offset provisions must never be repeated.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to thank the gentleman for the time he has put in on this legislation. I wish to say that his action today is going to facilitate the production of lumber very materially on this Indian reservation—lumber that is badly needed in the war effort and which cannot be used at the present time because no one knows who owns the timber. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. COCHRAN. It was at my suggestion, 8 years ago, the general offset provision was embodied in a deficiency bill. It has already saved the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. True, this is a small amount in comparison with other pending claims, and, frankly, I do not like to, but I am following the decision of the Attorney General because in the past many times I have justified my action on his advice.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States Court of Claims, by interlocutory judgment of December 1, 1941, in a suit by the Menominee Tribe of

Indians against the United States, No. 44294, brought pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 3, 1935 (ch. 839, 49 Stat. 1085), as amended, found and held that the Menominee Indians are entitled to recover from the United States the value of timber removed from, and the present acquisition cost of, certain swamplands within the boundaries of their reservation which the United States, in violation of the provisions of the treaty of May 12, 1854 (10 Stat. 1064), failed to convey to the Menominee Indians, but reserved for further proceedings the determination of the amount of the recovery and the deduction of offsets, if any; and

Whereas said act of September 3, 1935, provided that in the event of a judgment against the United States as aforesaid, the United States may in lieu of paying the present acquisition costs of such lands acquire and hold said lands in trust for the sole benefit and use of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, but provided no method for exercising such election: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That upon petition of the attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians the Court of Claims shall, in order to give effect to its interlocutory judgment, enter judgment in favor of the said tribe for (a) \$13,666.80, representing the amount of the recovery by reason of the timber removed since May 12, 1854, from the swamplands which the court has found the United States unlawfully failed to convey to the said tribe pursuant to the treaty of May 12, 1854; and (b) \$1,420,836.03, representing the present acquisition cost of such lands to the said tribe of Indians; and no offsets, including gratuities, shall be allowed to the United States in determining the amount of such judgment, but any such offsets which the United States may have, including gratuities, as defined in section 3 of the act of September 3, 1935 (ch. 839, 49 Stat. 1085), as amended, may be pleaded and allowed in any other suit now pending or hereafter to be brought by the Menominee Tribe of Indians against the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the entry of such judgment, which shall not bear interest, a copy or transcript thereof, certified by the clerk of the Court of Claims, and signed by the Chief Justice, or in his absence by the presiding judge of said court, shall be presented, as in other cases, to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall certify the same to the Congress for appropriation.

SEC. 3. After the entry of such judgment, the Court of Claims, without awaiting the appropriation by the Congress of money to pay the same, shall, on petition of attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians, determine the amount of fees which the attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians shall be entitled to receive under section 7 of the act of September 3, 1935, as amended.

SEC. 4. Upon the making of an appropriation by the Congress for the payment of the judgment rendered there shall be set aside from such appropriation a sum sufficient to pay the attorneys' fees, which shall, however, not be paid until after the completion of the purchase of the swamplands specified in section 1 (b), as hereinafter provided; said appropriation to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior as herein provided. The portion of such judgment representing the value of the timber specified in section 1 (a) less the pro rata amount thereof deductible for attorneys' fees, in the same ratio that the total amount of attorneys' fees bears to the amount of the judgment, shall upon the completion of the purchase of the said swamplands be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Menominee Tribe of Indians as provided in the last sentence of section 7 of the act of September 3, 1935, as amended. The balance of the ap-

propriation shall be available for the purchase from the State of Wisconsin, but not by eminent domain, of the swamplands specified in section 1 (b). The purchase of the said swamplands shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior, who is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States a quitclaim deed or other form of conveyance to such lands satisfactory to the attorney General of the United States. Title to such lands shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Menominee Tribe of Indians. The United States shall acquire and hold such lands for the sole benefit and use of the said Indians as if they had become part of the Menominee Reservation pursuant to the treaty of May 12, 1854.

SEC. 5. In the event that said purchase is not completed within 18 months after the entry of judgment by the Court of Claims, then, upon petition of the Attorney General or the attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians, the Court of Claims shall vacate and set aside the said judgment entered pursuant to section 1 hereof. Thereupon the court shall proceed to determine, as provided by the act of September 3, 1935, as amended, the amount of offsets, if any, deductible from the amounts specified in sections 1 (a) and 1 (b) of this act, and shall render final judgment pursuant to the terms of the act of September 3, 1935, as amended. In rendering final judgment under this section, the court may redetermine the amount of the attorneys' fees. Such judgment shall be satisfied from the appropriation made pursuant to sections 2 and 4 hereof; and any balance of moneys appropriated shall thereupon be carried to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 6. All acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith, including the act of September 3, 1935, are, to the extent of such conflict, modified accordingly.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 23, strike out "18 months" and insert "3 years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the letter, which I mentioned in my remarks, as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE SABOTAGE LAW (WARTIME)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3442, to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill has a rather extensive and substantial minority report I object.

Mr. KEAN and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are heard. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

TO TRANSFER CERTAIN LAND IN THE CROATAN NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1315, providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, on the last calendar day I objected to the consideration of this bill until I could secure some information from the county in which this land was located. I have received a letter from Mr. R. A. Nunn, county attorney for the county in which he states there is no objection and that they are in accord with the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert this letter at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

NEW BERN, N. C., November 23, 1943.

HON. G. A. BARDEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: Your letter of 20th instant with your colloquy with Representative FLANNAGAN has been received and I have read it with interest.

I have talked with some of the county commissioners and Mr. Ben O. Jones and they advise me to notify you they have no objection to the passage of the bill transferring lands within the marine base to the custody and control of the Navy.

The county was interested in getting its share of the proceeds of timber cut from the lands in the national forest.

With best wishes,

Yours truly,

R. A. NUNN.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy all lands owned by the United States and comprising a part of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina which are situated within the present boundaries of the Marine Corps Aviation Base, Cherry Point, N. C.: *Provided,* That in the event the area transferred pursuant to the provisions of this act shall cease to be used for military purposes, it shall revert to its former national-forest status.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING THE PERSON WHO SHALL ACT AS PRESIDENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 678, designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a

President-elect, nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in my opinion this matter is too important for the Consent Calendar. I therefore object.

Mr. COLE of New York and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are heard. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

COURT REPORTERS IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3611, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code (Act of March 3, 1911, 36 Stat. 1089, as amended) is hereby amended by inserting after section 5 thereof a new section 5a, entitled "Court Reporters," as follows:

"Sec. 5a. Court reporters:

"(a) Appointment: Each district court of the United States, including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the district courts in the Territories and insular possessions, shall appoint one or more court reporters for the district court in the manner provided for the appointment of the clerks of said courts. The persons to be so appointed shall possess the qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the duties specified in subdivision (b) of this section, to be determined by standards which shall be formulated from time to time by the Judicial Conference, and shall take an oath to perform faithfully such duties. The number of reporters to be so appointed shall be determined by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges (hereinafter referred to as the Judicial Conference). The court, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may appoint additional reporters for temporary service not exceeding 3 months, when there is more reporting work in the district than can be promptly performed by the authorized number of reporters and the urgency is so great as to render it impracticable to obtain the approval of the Judicial Conference. If the court and the Judicial Conference are of the opinion that in any district it is in the public interest that the duties of reporter should be combined with those of any other employee of the court, the Judicial Conference may authorize such a combination of positions and fix the salary therefor, as provided by subsection (c) hereof, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

"(b) Duties: One of the reporters so appointed for each district court shall attend at each session of the court and at every other proceeding that may be designated by rule of procedure or order of court or by one of the judges of the court, and shall record verbatim by shorthand or by mechanical means (1) all proceedings in criminal cases had in open court, whether in connection with plea, trial, or sentence; (2) all proceedings in all other cases had in open court unless the parties shall specifically agree to the contrary; and (3) such other proceedings as a judge of the court may direct or as may

be required by rule of procedure or order of the court or as may be requested by any party to the proceeding. The reporter shall attach his official certificate to the original shorthand notes or other original records so taken and promptly file them with the clerk of the court, who shall preserve them in the public records of the court for not less than 10 years. Upon the request of any party to any proceeding which has been so recorded or of a judge of the court, the reporter shall promptly transcribe the original records of the requested parts of the proceedings and attach thereto his official certificate, and shall then deliver the transcript to the party or judge making the request. He shall also transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases and such other parts of the record of proceedings as may be required by rule of procedure or order of court. The reporter shall promptly deliver to the clerk for the records of the court a certified copy of any transcript that he may make of any part of the record of any proceeding. The transcript of the testimony and proceedings in any case when duly certified by such reporter shall be deemed prima facie a correct statement of such testimony and proceedings. No transcripts of the proceedings of the court shall be considered as official except those made from the records taken by the reporter so appointed. The said original notes or other original records and the said copy of transcript shall be open to inspection in the office of the clerk as provided by law with respect to books containing the docket or minute of judgments, or decrees thereof.

"(c) Compensation: Each reporter so appointed shall receive an annual salary, to be fixed from time to time by the Judicial Conference and to be paid in the same manner and at the same time that the salary of the clerk of the court is paid. In fixing such salary the Judicial Conference shall take into account in each instance the amount of time the reporter is required to be in attendance upon the court engaged in the performance of his duties. Such salary shall not exceed \$3,000 per annum, except that if the amount of time any reporter is required to attend upon the court in the performance of his duties exceeds 30 weeks annually, as determined by the Judicial Conference, the salary may in the discretion of the Judicial Conference be fixed in that instance at an amount not exceeding \$5,000 per annum. The reporter shall also receive his traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence within the limitations prescribed by law for clerks of district courts while necessarily absent on official business from the place of his regular employment. Necessary equipment and supplies for recording the proceedings shall be furnished to the reporter by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. All other supplies shall be furnished by the reporter at his own expense. In addition, the reporter may charge and collect from parties, including the United States, who request transcripts, such fees therefor and no other, as may be prescribed from time to time by the court subject to the approval of the Judicial Conference. The fees for transcripts of pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases and for transcripts furnished to a judge for his personal use shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose. No fee shall be charged or taxed for any copy of a transcript delivered to the clerk for the records of court as required by subdivision (b) of this section. Fees for transcripts furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed to sue, defend, or appeal in forma pauperis shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose; and the fees for transcripts

furnished in other than criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons permitted to appeal in forma pauperis shall also be paid by the United States if the trial judge shall certify that the appeal is not frivolous but presents a substantial question. Except as to transcripts that are to be paid for by the United States, the reporter may require any party requesting a transcript to prepay the estimated fee therefor in advance of delivery of the transcript.

"(d) Administration: The Judicial Conference shall supervise and direct the administration of this section. Subject to this section and pertinent laws, it shall be the duty of the court to supervise and direct the reporter in the performance of his duties, including dealings with parties requesting transcripts. The Judicial Conference shall prescribe records which shall be maintained and reports which shall be filed by the reporter. Such records shall be inspected and audited in the same manner as the records and accounts of the clerk and may include records showing (1) the quantity of transcripts prepared, (2) the fees charged and the fees collected for transcripts, (3) any expenses incurred by the reporter in connection with transcripts, (4) the amount of time the reporter is in attendance upon the court for the purpose of recording proceedings, and (5) such other information as the Judicial Conference may determine.

"(e) Taxation of fees as costs: In the discretion of the court any part or all of the fees for transcripts may be taxed as costs in the case. Fees paid by the United States for transcripts furnished to persons allowed to appeal in civil cases in forma pauperis shall be taxed in favor of the United States as costs in the case."

Sec. 2. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent or repugnant to the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING AN EASEMENT FOR AN OIL PIPE LINE OVER THE OGDEN ORDNANCE DEPOT MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1483, to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like for some member, either of the Committee on Military Affairs or the author of the bill, to explain the provisions of the measure, which apparently gives a permanent easement to an oil company for the construction and maintenance of a pipe line over Federal property. If there is nobody available to explain it, I ask that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 44 OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2232, to amend section 44 of the Long-

shoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Commission may, in its discretion and to the extent that it shall determine to be advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established under this section, make payments from such fund upon any award heretofore or hereafter made providing for the payment of death benefits or compensation for permanent total and permanent partial disability, and may provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of this Act in any case of disability, where there has been default in the payment of compensation or of the furnishing of such medical treatment, in any case in which the Commission shall determine that the employer had failed to secure compensation as provided by section 32 of this act and such default was due to the insolvency of the employer, and in any case in which such default is due to the insolvency of an insured employer and his insurance carrier. Such an uninsured employer or such insured employer and such insurance carrier shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Commission under the authority of this subsection, including the cost of any benefits under section 7 of this act paid from such fund; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Commission, for the benefit of said fund, shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer or carrier, or both, and may be a proceeding in the name of the Commission under section 18 or under subdivision (C) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default, or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Commission is possible, or the Commission may settle and compromise any such claim.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "may," insert "upon application by a person entitled to compensation or upon its own motion."

Page 2, at the end of line 4, following "disability," insert "as found by the deputy commissioner to be needed."

Page 2, at the end of line 11, insert "The procedure in respect of claims, modification of awards, judicial review, and the adjudicatory processes as provided by this act and regulations thereunder, shall not be affected because of payment of benefits from such special fund, except that the Commission as representing the interest of such special fund, may appear, in addition to the employer, in any proceeding before the deputy commissioner in respect of any claim or award in which benefits may be payable from such fund, and shall have all the rights of an employer under this act, including those in respect to proceedings before the deputy commissioner and proceedings for judicial review."

Page 2, in lines 14 and 16, after the word "paid" insert "and to be paid."

Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "be" and insert "bring."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "(C)" and insert "(c)".

Page 2, line 24, after "both," insert "and".

Page 3, line 1, after "default" insert "including the value of future compensation and other benefits."

Page 3, line 3, after "claim," insert "For the foregoing purposes, the Commission is authorized to make, from any annual appropriation for expenses of administration of this act, necessary expenditures for court costs, witness fees, or other expenses incident to initiation or carrying out of any such proceedings or for the purpose of investigating the case of any person claiming benefits or continuation of benefits from such special fund. For the purpose of proceeding against any defaulting employer or insurance carrier under this subdivision, the deputy commissioner shall, in the manner prescribed in section 18 of this act, determine not only compensation in default but the value of future compensation and the value of probable future medical and other costs for services required of the employer by section 7 of this act. The provisions of section 18 and section 21 of this act shall apply with respect to a compensation order declaring such default, and the Commission shall have all rights, for the benefit of such fund, as an applicant or beneficiary under such sections."

Page 3, at the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. That section 38 of said act be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 38. (a) Any employer required to secure the payment of compensation under this act who fails to secure such compensation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and in any case where such employer is a corporation, the president, secretary, and treasurer thereof shall be also severally liable to such fine or imprisonment as herein provided for the failure of such corporation to secure the payment of compensation; and such president, secretary, and treasurer shall be severally personally liable, jointly with such corporation, for any compensation or other benefit which may accrue under the said act in respect to any injury which may occur to any employee of such corporation while it shall so fail to secure the payment of compensation as required by section 32 of this act.

"(b) Any employer who knowingly transfers, sells, encumbers, assigns, or in any manner disposes of, conceals, secretes, or destroys any property belonging to such employer, after one of his employees has been injured within the purview of this act, and with the intent to avoid the payment of compensation under this act to such employee or his dependents, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and in any case where such employer is a corporation, the president, secretary, and treasurer thereof shall be also severally liable to such penalty of imprisonment as well as jointly liable with such corporation for such fine.

"(c) This section shall not affect any other liability of the employer under this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act."

EXPEDITING PAYMENTS FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING THE WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 919, to expedite the payment for lands acquired during the war period.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO REMIT CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES ON ACCOUNT OF OVERPAYMENTS TO PART-TIME CHARWOMEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3449, to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That remission is hereby made of any and all claims of the United States in consequence of payments of wages at the rate of 78 cents an hour, rather than at some lower rate or rates, for work performed during the period from August 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943, both dates inclusive, by part-time charwomen employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department. Remission is hereby made of any and all claims of the United States in consequence of payments of wages for hours of work in any one week in excess of 40 at the overtime rate of one and one-half times the rate at which payments were made for the first 40 hours of work in that week, rather than at some lower rate or rates, for work performed on or after December 22, 1942, by any of said part-time charwomen pursuant to temporary details (pending promotions) to assignments requiring 48 hours' work in 1 week. Said remissions are hereby made notwithstanding any determination that the rate or rates at which said payments of wages were made is or are in excess of the rate or rates of pay established by law for said employment: *Provided*, That if said payments of wages at said rate of 78 cents an hour and at said overtime rate are otherwise correct, the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit therefor in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, to make no charge against any certifying officer because of certification of said payments of wages, and to remove every charge, if any, heretofore made against any certifying officer because of certification of said payment of wages.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make refunds of any and all amounts heretofore withheld or deducted from wages paid to any of said part-time charwomen for work performed after June 30, 1943, in satisfaction or partial satisfaction of any and all claims or asserted claims of the United States in consequence of said payments of wages at said rate of 78 cents and at said overtime rate. The annual appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, 1944, is hereby made available to the extent of \$700 for the purpose of making said refunds as herein provided.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST AS A RESULT OF FIRES ON LONG ISLAND, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3605, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion,

Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$6,562.47, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in fires occurring in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS AT NORFOLK NAVY YARD, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3606, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$5,554.95, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL AS RESULT OF FIRE AT AMPHIBIOUS TRAINING STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3607, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or

damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$221.34, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman why Calendar No. 199 cannot be considered at this time?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a bill must be on the calendar for 3 legislative days. I understand that this bill has not been on the calendar for 3 legislative days.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very urgent matter.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman's bill. I am just calling the attention of the House to the fact.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter, as outlined in a letter to the Speaker and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time. The gentlemen on the committee have not gone into the merits of this bill and it cannot be called up today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address by Judge Neal W. Workman, of Newberry, S. C., on Armistice Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS COVERING THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR PEARL HARBOR CATASTROPHE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 199.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on December 7, 1941, caused shock and humiliation to the people of the United States; and

Whereas said attack needlessly caused a tremendous loss of life, property, and prestige as well as immediately jeopardizing the security of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the ability of the Japanese to successfully execute such an attack was a serious and alarming reflection upon those civil and military officials responsible for the maintenance of our national security; and

Whereas a commission appointed by the President to investigate the circumstances surrounding such attack has reported their findings, and such findings have been released in part, indicating a grave dereliction of duty on the part of those military and civil officials responsible for our defenses, and national security at Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas as a result of said commission's report certain Army and Navy officers have been removed from active duty and the public has been assured that as soon as the exigencies of war permit these officers will be court-martialed; and

Whereas the period of time provided by statute, the Articles of War, Government, and Naval Regulations, wherein such prosecutions must commence is about to elapse; and

Whereas the public has been assured also that such limitations will be waived by the officers already named and suggested as having been derelict in their duty; and

Whereas as a matter of law there is doubt that such officers and the departments concerned have any authority to waive any such limitations; and

Whereas there is just reason for believing that there are those persons other than the military officers already named in the commission's report, who may also share in any dereliction of duty that resulted in the Pearl Harbor catastrophe; and

Whereas any statute, article, regulation, or provision of limitation would operate in any event to bar prosecution of any such person whether he be civilian or military; and

Whereas it is highly important and vitally necessary, as soon as war conditions permit, that full and proper inquiry be made respecting this disgraceful national calamity, that responsibility be fixed, and that guilty parties, whether military or civil, be adequately punished, and that this matter is too grave and serious to permit parties who may be equally or more guilty than the Army and Navy officers already named in the commission's report to escape their full share of the responsibility and any just punishment they may deserve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, we all know, of course, that it is only a very unusual emergency condition which would justify a bill not reported out of a committee being considered by the House in this manner. There is no question but what an emergency situation exists and that this bill tends to meet this situation. It is important, therefore, that the bill be enacted forthwith. However, in agreeing to it being brought up by unanimous consent without being reported out of a committee, I want the RECORD to definitely and specifically show that this is not to be considered as a precedent. We have to respond to exigency when exigency requires action. An emergent condition exists which the bill called up by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] aims to meet and correct. In my opinion, this bill is a sound one, the bill should pass, but it is only because immediate action is absolutely essential that this unusual procedure is permitted. Under no condition is the action in not objecting to this unanimous consent request, and I hope the House will agree to the request, to be construed, particularly in connection with a bill not reported out of a committee, as a precedent for future similar action unless a similar emergency exists.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for the excellent statement he has made and the opinion he has expressed, in which I most heartily concur. I am glad, too, that he wants the RECORD to show that this is not to be construed as a precedent. I do appreciate the fine attitude of the distinguished majority leader and his spirit of cooperation in getting this emergency legislation passed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman intend this to apply to civil persons in civil life as well as to military personnel?

Mr. SHORT. Civil as well as military, providing they are found guilty of dereliction of duty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT.]?

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri if it is his intention in extending the statute of limitations to provide that there will be a court martial of the commanding officers in the area involved after the present war is over?

Mr. SHORT. This resolution, if passed, will legalize after the expiration of the statute of limitations the court-martialing not only of General Short and Admiral Kimmel, but any other military authorities or civil authorities who might after thorough investigation be found guilty of dereliction of duty.

Mr. WINTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe we can enact an ex post facto law that will extend the time

of the statute of limitations on court martials beyond the time in which a man should be prosecuted?

Mr. SHORT. I am no lawyer or son of a lawyer, but I have read a little law. There is serious doubt in my mind whether these officers can in advance waive the statute of limitations. It seems to me that if the two Houses of Congress concur and pass a joint resolution, they can extend the time of court martial or trial. That is a matter for the courts to decide.

Mr. WINTER. Would this extend the time in which a private in the Army could be prosecuted in a court martial?

Mr. SHORT. This applies only to those cases that are directly connected with Pearl Harbor, the catastrophe of December 7, 1941. It is limited merely to that one incident.

Mr. WINTER. As I understand the matter, the gentleman wants to guarantee that these two commanding officers will be court-martialed?

Mr. SHORT. It is not guaranteeing it, but it certainly is extending the time for 1 year after the cessation of hostilities. We have been assured that unless war exigencies permit they will not be court-martialed. Of course, they cannot very well be court-martialed now, with the war raging and going on. But after the war is over they can be tried if we pass this joint resolution. However, the statute of limitations is going to lapse before the end of the war. That is the purpose of introducing this joint resolution.

Mr. WINTER. Does the gentleman believe that if his resolution is adopted and the time is extended and this court martial is not held, until the year allowed under this resolution expires Short and Kimmel can be tried under a court martial?

Mr. SHORT. No, I do not think they could be. This gives them a whole year after the war in which to be tried. If they are not going to prosecute men within 2 or 3 or 4 years after the incident, of course we should let it go. Mr. Speaker, all this resolution does is toll the statute for 1 year after the war.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I advise the gentleman from Missouri that several months ago I introduced a measure which would prevent any person from waiving the provision of the statute of limitation, having in mind that it is the duty of Government to bring anybody suspected of dereliction of duty to trial within that period of time. That did not contemplate that the court martial should be completed within the 2 years, but simply that the proceeding should be started within that time. As far as I know, no report has come from either of the departments on that bill. It is apparent that they desire to have the period of the statute of limitations expire. When it does expire, it is questionable whether any court martial or trial of these responsible officials may be had at all. May I ask the gentleman if the purpose of his

resolution is to preserve that right until after the war.

Mr. SHORT. It is. That is exactly the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. So that the persons may be brought to trial within 1 year after the cessation of hostilities with Japan, and if they are not brought to court martial by the Government within that period of time, it will be an admission that they were not guilty of any offense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I think the explanation the gentleman from New York has given shows that the bill he himself introduced is identical in purpose and intent with the resolution that has been introduced.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire of the gentleman from Missouri if his bill does not contemplate Executive approval prior to the expiration of December 7, 1943; and if so, if he is sure that he might have that approval before the time expires?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, I do not know just where the Chief Executive is at this moment. I think it is a good thing that none of us knows exactly where he is. But we have a Vice President, I think, in the Capitol, who perhaps could act in his place.

Mr. COLE of New York. My reason for bringing up this question is to find whether the resolution is worded so that if Executive endorsement should be fixed subsequent to December 7, 1943, the effect might be retroactive, to be effective prior to December 7.

Mr. SHORT. That is a question I cannot answer.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. SHORT. I know; but there are a lot of things the gentleman from Missouri does not know about parliamentary procedure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the wording of the resolution such as would make it in and of itself operative as of a particular date prior to December 7, or does it become effective when it is signed by the President?

Mr. SHORT. For it to be effective, I surmise the President would have to sign it. I defer to the judgment of the able gentleman from New York on this point.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the resolution should be changed.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] that this is not an ex post facto law because this has nothing to do with the change of the law as to the commission of the crime.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. It is merely the extension of the time in which the man may be tried.

There is another reason why this resolution should be passed. I doubt very seriously whether these gentlemen can waive the statute of limitations in advance. I as a lawyer and a former prosecuting attorney have observed that when you called a man for trial he had then to decide whether or not he would plead the statute of limitations. So I am afraid

that if this measure is not passed you will have no way to compel these two men to waive the statute of limitations. Certainly that waiver cannot apply to others who are probably more guilty than they are, in aiding the enemy during that attack. I hope the gentleman's resolution will pass. I think the President can give his approval in such a way as to make it become law today or tomorrow.

Mr. WINTER. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that by the same token if these gentlemen could not be tried after today or tomorrow, neither can they be tried by the extension of the statute of limitations on a crime in which the statute of limitation started to run 2 years ago and expires tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WINTER. The courts of this country have passed on it a thousand times. It just simply cannot be done.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that if Congress can pass a law creating a statute of limitations, why could not the same Congress extend it for an additional year; and since we have been assured the court martial will be held when the exigencies of war permit, then we will have a whole year after the war is ended in which to try these men.

Mr. WINTER. Congress may extend the statute of limitations on a crime that has not been committed, but if I commit a crime on which the statute of limitations is 2 years, you cannot extend that statute of limitations after the time I commit the crime in order to prosecute me later on.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand that the gentleman's bill applies to both civilian and military men. Therefore, there could well be two rules. As to the rule with reference to the tolling of the statute of limitations insofar as civilians are concerned, there may be a question as to whether or not this Congress can do it. The only body we can get the correct answer from in reference to that question is the Supreme Court of the United States. The rule as to whether or not this Congress has the right to toll the statute of limitations in regard to military men and their court martial and trial, I think, is without question. Therefore the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri is in proper form and it is the only resolution we can get as to the question of extending this time to anyone. If there is any good to be done by it, it should be done in this manner by passing this resolution and if any portion of it is not valid, then the Supreme Court of the United States will say so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 3, line 3, after "that" insert "effective as of December 7, 1943."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF THE THREE POWERS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following declaration, which was read by the Clerk:

DECLARATION OF THE THREE POWERS

We, the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these 4 days past, in this, the Capital of our ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.

We express our determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow.

As to war, our military staffs have joined in our round-table discussions, and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations to be undertaken from the east, west, and south.

The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

And as to peace, we are sure that our concord will win an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the goodwill of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them, as they may choose to come, into a world family of democratic nations.

No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea, and their war plants from the air.

Our attack will be relentless and increasing.

Emerging from these cordial conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose.

Signed: Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.
Signed at Teheran, December 1, 1943.

JUSTIFICATIONS SUBMITTED THROUGH THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a situation has arisen that I feel should be

brought to the attention of the House and of the country. For several years the Bureau of the Budget has been asking for increased funds. Some such increases have been allowed by the Congress. The result has been that there have been more confusing and more intricate justifications submitted by the different departments so that it is more and more difficult to find out what these appropriations are. Every member of the minority of the Appropriations Committee is committed to try to find out what is in those bills, no matter how intricate they are and if difficulties arise with reference to the reporting of these bills and their consideration subsequently, I want the Congress and the people to know where the responsibility lies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by Mr. Roscoe I. Downs, of Arlington, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I hope that there are members of both the Military Affairs and World War Veterans' Legislation Committees present on the floor this afternoon, as I believe that the problem I am about to discuss will be of particular interest to the membership of those two committees.

Many Members of the House have had letters from men who have served in the present war, who have been wounded and discharged, complaining of the months that elapse between the day of discharge from the service to the date they are placed on the compensation rolls of the Veterans' Administration. From what inquiries I have been able to make, it appears to me that at the present time the fault lies pretty largely with the War and Navy Departments and, to a lesser extent, with the Veterans' Administration.

During the summer recess a Red Cross worker brought a young man, 20 years of age, into my office. He had been discharged by the Army at some camp in South Carolina and permitted to travel alone to his home in Connecticut. His mind seemed to be a complete blank. He did not know the name of the organization with which he had served. He had no recollection of where, how, or when he was wounded, although he did say he had been in battles. Later investigation disclosed that he certainly had been in battles. He had gone through the whole African invasion and campaign and his disability was brought about by the explosion of a large shell

not many feet from where he was standing. To permit a young man to return to his home in that condition is a disgrace. No one to advise his family as to the type of care he needed; no papers that would be helpful in filing a Veterans' Administration claim. In fact, he was just cut adrift to flounder as he would. Such things must not be allowed to continue.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts who has done so much to help the veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Only yesterday in a hospital I was talking to a man who had received a very severe head wound. I asked him where he lived. He remembered his State but for a while could not remember the town where he lived. At the end of the conversation he remembered, he said, for the first time, his town. He said: "I am just coming out of a haze; I am just beginning to realize that I am alive again but I cannot focus my mind on things."

That is right in line with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is almost criminal to permit men to travel in that condition.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKES). Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman believe that we should provide that before a man is discharged from the Army or the Navy in such condition that he be turned over to the Veterans' Bureau and placed in Veterans' Administration facilities immediately instead of being turned out on the street?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely. I am going to touch on that later in my remarks.

My contention is that the Veterans' Administration should put contact men in these hospitals and that these men should be turned directly over to the Veterans' Administration and not sent home in such a confused condition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Connecticut knows, of course, that the World War Veterans' Committee has done its very best under the circumstances. The trouble has been that the cases of many of these men have not been turned over to the Veterans' Administration. I am informed that the Secretary of War has issued a directive—I have not a copy of it yet, but hope to have one in the next 24 hours—that will correct that condition to a large extent.

What we are trying to do is to speed up the adjudication of these cases because we do not want these men who are disabled as a result of their war service to come home and not have something to live on from the very beginning. It would be a grave injustice to them not to make provision to take care of them as soon as they get home.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the war and Navy records should be in such shape that the cases can be adjudicated immediately. I have nothing but praise for the work of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. Thousands of disabled veterans call her Blessed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I introduced a bill on Friday that would take care of that when the records cannot be found. We all know that many of the Pearl Harbor records are lost and they can never be secured again. My bill would provide that the men would be assured of pay whether kept in the hospital or sent home under furlough and they would not receive their discharges until their cases had been thoroughly gone into and rated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think that would cure the situation. No one should be discharged until their records are complete in every respect.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BURKE], also has introduced a bill and I think perhaps our two bills could be combined.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope we can get action at once.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say, as the gentleman has already touched upon that matter, that these records are not all together. When a man comes home after he is discharged and he is released, his record has not been assembled, and especially his medical record. This causes a hardship because on his discharge he cannot immediately file his claim.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is right. His medical records should be assembled before discharge.

Mr. BROOKS. That is causing a delay of many months in some cases.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. When the Burke-Wadsworth selective-service bill passed through the House I introduced an amendment that was adopted. My amendment provided that the War and Navy Departments should give to the man at the time of discharge a statement showing his periods of hospitalization, illnesses, and so forth. During the seventy-seventh session of Congress that provision was repealed. I remember reading the debates at the time. The War Department contended it involved

too much paper work. Now, I have no sympathy with the excuse that it involves paper work. They have the help to do the paper work. They went on to say that in many cases it was not wise to give the man his diagnosis. But there was nothing in my amendment that required the diagnosis to be made available to the man. All I wanted, and the only purpose of the amendment, was to make certain that when the man was discharged he would have a statement indicating that his record was complete. I did not care what the diagnosis was. I wanted it so that in 2 or 3 years after discharge when he files for compensation and he alleges he was hospitalized in Africa at such and such a date, the War Department could not say, "We have no record of it."

Mr. BROOKS. The bill I have presented is a bill that will permit the man at the very moment he is discharged to have a physical examination, it would permit him to be interviewed by a representative from the service organizations recognized by the Veterans' Bureau, then he would file his petition or claim at that very moment of his discharge so that it can be acted on immediately and no undue delay will result.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I believe that is very necessary legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I happen to have received a letter this morning from a mother who tells me about her son in the service. There are also two brothers in the service. He had not seen one of his brothers for 5 years, who had been in the service also and was at home. This man was hospitalized in the South. The boy lived in St. Louis. The boy came to St. Louis to see his brother and mother. When he went back why he was A. W. O. L. He was put in the guardhouse and he was fined for his absence. It is evident to me from a reading of that letter that the boy is a mental patient. Does the gentleman think he should be punished under those circumstances?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Certainly not. He should be referred to a psychiatrist and given the benefit of treatment. I have a case in my own file at the present time involving a man who went A. W. O. L. or deserted last February. There is no question about it. He has been examined by psychiatrists and is in need of treatment. He should be treated as a sick man and not as a prisoner. No serviceman should be court-martialed without a psychiatrist's report being presented to the court if the man has seen combat service.

Mr. COCHRAN. This man I refer to went through the Guadalcanal campaign, I may say.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They may try him before officers who never heard a shot fired. It is not right.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It is my contention that when a man comes out of the armed services disabled, the burden of proof should be on the War Department to show that he was in that condition before he was taken into the service, and that his service did not injure him. That is the presumption we really wrote in the law, and I am sure now that that presumption will be carried out. It does not matter whether his records are lost or not, if he has been in the service and comes out of the service mentally or physically disabled, the presumption is that he got his disability in the service and he should be compensated and hospitalized accordingly.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I know the gentleman has written that into bills and it has been the law, but it is hard to get the Veterans' Administration to accept that. The claimant has to prove beyond shadow of doubt that his disability resulted from service.

Mr. RANKIN. There were a great many records lost in the last war of men who came back disabled as a result of their military service. We had to put them on the roll by the Presumptive Act of 1924. We missed a great many of them, and I attempted to put them on by an extension of that act in 1930. Of course, that act was vetoed. Then the Disability Allowance Act was passed. We certainly do not want to have that trouble again, and for that reason I have asked Members to sign this petition so that we may have this legislation before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in order that we may legislate now to take care of these men who are coming out of the service, many of them totally and permanently disabled and whose records have been lost or destroyed.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The extension of the presumptive clause would have been better than the Disability Allowance Act.

If the Members of the House would realize how acute this problem is at the present time and how many servicemen are involved, we would get the necessary 218 signatures this afternoon to petition No. 8. It is just as important that one House committee handle veterans' legislation than it is that one agency of the Government administer veterans' legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman spoke of the insurance difficulties. I wonder if he does not feel, as I do, that it would be very helpful if the insurance could be paid to the veteran, when he is totally and permanently disabled, in a lump sum if he wishes it that way. Then he could invest it in a business. I think it might be very helpful to him.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. My mind is open to that suggestion. I think I would rather like the idea of the insurance being paid monthly over a

long period of time, for a period of years. At least, that guarantees that the veterans will have that money to live on. I am afraid there are too many oil well salesmen still in existence to make the lump sum payment quite safe, particularly in the cases of those men who have total and permanent disability because of nervous or mental disability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are other cases where they would be glad to have it, perhaps to put it in a business and get started.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Whatever the gentleman from Massachusetts recommends along that line would carry a great deal of weight with me. The veteran has no more loyal friend in the House than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If we are to treat the veterans of this war fairly, it is imperative that action be had on this measure this year.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very definitely, for there are hundreds of cases piling up on which we cannot get justice unless we get some legislation through this Congress.

If time permits, I should like to develop briefly one other thought. It is my sincere belief that every detail of the program we adopt in reference to the rehabilitation of the men and women who serve in the present war should be under the direction of the Veterans' Administration. You will recall the situation that existed at the end of World War No. 1. We had no Veterans' Administration at that time. Men were hospitalized under the Public Health Service, and their records were in the custody of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. When they took vocational training, some of their records went to the Bureau of Vocational Training. I think this time we should be sure that we have a central agency that deals with all problems of rehabilitating a man from the day he is discharged from the Army or Navy until he is restored to full usefulness, if that is possible, back in his community.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted at the twenty-ninth annual convention of Hadassah at New York City, October 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD remarks which I previously obtained permission to extend but on which the time for inserting in the RECORD has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE GUAYULE RUBBER PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I took the floor to discuss the progress of our synthetic-rubber program. In that discussion I stated that we have approximately \$750,000,000 invested in the program, and that by the end of 1944 we will be producing at the rate of 850,000 tons of rubber per year. That will be more than the amount of rubber we normally use. This indicates that we will be self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned.

There is a philosophy prevalent that when the war is over, we should liquidate these rubber plants and turn the rubber business over to the rubber monopoly. I take an opposite view because I feel that in the post-war period we will be able to make synthetic rubber in sufficient quantities and at a price which will allow competition between synthetic and natural rubber.

Following my remarks on the synthetic-rubber program, I was asked to give some information about the progress being made in the development of rubber from guayule and also the matter of price of the guayule rubber program. For the information of the House I include with my remarks detailed information concerning guayule and the guayule rubber program furnished to me by the Forestry Service:

Guayule plantations, all in California, have been established as follows:

	Irrigated land	Unirrigated land	Total
	Acres	Acres	Acres
Spring of 1942.....	808	808	808
Fiscal year 1943.....	15,161	6,344	21,505
Fiscal year 1944 (to be finished in December 1943).....	7,175	2,452	9,627
Total.....	22,336	9,604	31,940

In addition to the plantation acreages listed above, numerous test planting and indicator plots aggregating some 1,500 acres have been established in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California to determine the suitability for guayule culture of climate, water, and soils in selected areas in these States.

Guayule has been grown successfully in the Salinas Valley, a coastal valley of central California, for many years by the Intercontinental Rubber Co. Although experiments with irrigated lands were undertaken, experience led the company to utilize unirrigated lands as the safest and cheapest operation, with the object of maturing a crop in about 4 years. The Forest Service started plantings on unirrigated land in conformity with the company's procedure. However, it soon became apparent that if large acreages were found essential for an adequate volume of guayule production, it would be difficult to obtain sufficient unirrigated lands having characteristics similar to that on which guayule previously had been grown most successfully. Analysis of the available but slender amount of experimental information related to guayule culture led to a belief that guayule probably could be grown successfully on irrigated lands, if carefully handled, to millable size and rubber content in about half the time normally required on unirrigated lands in the cool coastal valleys of California.

In the summer of 1942 the urgency to produce rubber as quickly as possible was great. The risk involved in utilizing irrigated lands was acknowledged, as was the increased cost of so doing. The Baruch committee report of September 1942 strongly urged a greatly expanded guayule program that included the use of irrigated lands. The project was thereupon granted a much enlarged planting authorization and increased appropriations by Congress, and in the fall of 1942 embarked on a plan having an objective to plant about 86,000 acres by the end of the planting season in the late spring of 1943. Test plantings on both irrigated and unirrigated lands in regions thought to be generally suitable were established from southern Texas to northern California to determine where plantings necessary in fiscal year 1944 and later might best be made.

Although the planting plans drawn in the late summer of 1942 for very large planting acreages were sharply curtailed in March 1943 to minimize interference with food production, and nearly half of the acreage actually leased by that date for planting has been returned to the owners, substantial acreages of both irrigated and unirrigated lands have been planted. It is anticipated that the first crops to attain size and rubber content suitable for milling will be available for harvest in the fall of 1944. Other later plantings would reach minimum size for harvest at various intervals during the following 3 years. Until the guayule crops have been carried through to harvest and the rubber extracted, the success of the work will not be completely demonstrated. At present, good crops of guayule are growing on both irrigated and unirrigated land. It is necessary to rely now on survival counts and plant analyses for information. Latest reports indi-

cate survival of shrub in plantations made in fiscal year 1943 as approximately 76 percent for irrigated shrub and 64 percent for unirrigated shrub. Analyses of 10-month-old shrub in test plantings scattered throughout California and the Southwest, indicate that shrub production on irrigated land averaged better than twice as great as on unirrigated lands. Rubber production in plots on irrigated lands was nearly three times as large as on unirrigated lands. A representative average irrigated plot at 10 months after establishment tested at the rate of 106 to 160 pounds of rubber per acre. The spread is accounted for by tests made of the effect of spacing of plants on rubber production per acre. An average dry-land plot tested 31 to 36 pounds per acre. Highest honors to date fall to an irrigated plot near Phoenix, Ariz., which tested at the rate of 231 to 300 pounds of rubber per acre.

Unless unforeseen and severe difficulties are encountered in the future, it is expected that crops of guayule will be successfully brought to maturity on both dry and irrigated land in the California plantations and on the test plots in the four Southwestern States.

This does not mean that all problems bearing on the culture of guayule are solved. Rather is the project in the process of ascertaining and establishing the methods best calculated to produce maximum poundage of rubber per acre under the variations of local climate and soil characteristics within the areas where guayule may safely be grown. Localities as dissimilar in some characteristics as the irrigated lands in the San Joaquin Valley of California and the unirrigated Rio Grande plains of southern Texas are being tested.

Considerable progress has been made in improving cultural equipment and practices, the results of which will definitely be reflected in future operating costs. For example, when the nursery program was expanded outside of the Salinas Valley, more porous soils were selected and duckboards (for use as tracks to support machinery) were dispensed with, at a saving of some \$500,000. Dispensing with the duckboards also reduced nursery sowing costs materially, because of a considerable reduction of hand labor required to lay the duckboards before sowing and their removal, storage, and repair at the end of the nursery growing season.

By adopting the use of oil sprays in the nurseries for weed control, large savings in hand labor and money were effected. The use of oil sprays for weed control in field plantations has reduced labor requirements approximately 50 percent, but over-all weed cost remains about the same, due to the cost of the oil. Experiments now in progress with a new flame-throwing cultivator are promising and will, if proved successful, materially reduce weed control costs in field plantations.

Approximately 250,000 pounds of clean guayule seed is being collected this year with improved seed collectors, at less than 20 cents per pound, untreated. Comparable costs with original pickers acquired by the Government were about 30 cents per pound, at pre-war labor costs. This saving was accomplished by the development of an entirely new, inexpensive four-row seed picker which gathers seed from 15 acres a day, as against 7 or 8 acres per day with the two-row company machine.

Planting machinery and technique have been greatly improved by adapting a commercial planter costing approximately \$500, as against a locally designed and constructed machine which cost approximately \$1,025 at pre-war labor and material prices. Planting crews on 4-row machines have been more highly trained and now are composed of 10 men, as against the former practice of using

14-man crews. Accomplishments of both crews are approximately the same—8 to 10 acres per day, depending on soil, weather, and other conditions.

Direct seeding, that is the sowing of seed directly in the field, is being carried on experimentally with considerable success under irrigation. Assured success with this procedure would eliminate the need for nurseries which require a very heavy capital investment per acre. The extent to which production costs would be affected cannot be estimated at the present stage of this experiment.

Costs of operations to date are high and undoubtedly can be lowered in the future. This is due in a considerable measure to the present experimental and developmental nature of the program, but probably more importantly to the fact that between September 1942 and March 1943 an organization, improvements and facilities were developed to execute a much greater program than subsequently was carried out. This basic structure was carried on a stand-by though reduced-scale basis in anticipation of a possible request by the Rubber Director for resumption of work on an expanded scale. The request materialized in the late summer of 1943, and final action on an appropriation estimate for funds to undertake the expanded program is pending in Congress as this memorandum is written.

Based on present operating requirements of the project, the costs of agricultural phases of the program are approximately as follows for California operations:

	Irrigated land	Unirrigated land
Average annual land rent, per acre.....	\$28.50	\$8
Production of nursery stock for planting, per acre.....	55.00	55
Farming costs, first year—ground preparation, preirrigation, planting, weed control, cultivation, and irrigation.....	110.00	75
Farming costs, second year.....	100.00	50
Farming costs, third year and later, no adequate basis for estimating.		

GUAYULE RUBBER PRODUCTION

The only guayule rubber produced so far on a commercial scale by the emergency rubber project was obtained from old shrub purchased from the Intercontinental Rubber Co., and from wild shrub now being harvested in the Big Bend area of Texas. The cost of guayule rubber produced from these sources is not indicative of the cost of producing rubber from the cultivated shrub planted by the project.

In the spring of 1943 the Emergency Rubber Project milled at Salinas, Calif., 876,200 pounds of crude underseeded rubber from 550 acres of 13-year-old over-mature shrub purchased from the Intercontinental Rubber Co. The cost of producing this rubber was 28 cents per pound. This cost includes the purchase price of the shrub (a little less than 10 cents per pound), care of the field for about a year after purchase, harvesting, milling, and necessary supervision and overhead. The total cost of harvesting and milling this shrub was \$63.80 per ton of shrub, dry weight, or 18 cents per pound of rubber. What the company's planting and carrying costs were for this shrub is not known, but it seems unlikely that the price paid for the shrub by the Government covered the actual costs. This shrub should have been harvested at an earlier age when it reached maturity. Because of its over-mature condition, its potential rubber yield was reduced, and consequently the costs per pound of rubber increased.

The cost of harvesting and milling the cultivated shrub in 1943 is not indicative

of what such a cost should ordinarily be. All operations were undertaken by inexperienced crews and experimentation in digging, curing, baling, and in various steps of milling were carried on. This first operation was considered as an experimental effort as well as a production job and consequently was carried on over a longer period and in a different manner than a straight production job. Much was learned about all phases of the harvesting and milling jobs. Improvements in operations were made during this campaign and bases for further improvements in later campaigns were developed.

Since the shrub planted by the Emergency Rubber Project is not yet old enough to yield satisfactory quantities of rubber, none of it has been harvested for production purposes. It is impossible, therefore, to determine accurately by actual experience how much it will cost per pound to produce guayule rubber from cultivated shrub under present operating conditions. Positive information is not yet available concerning the volume of 2-year-old shrub that can be produced per acre on irrigated land, nor what the rubber content of such shrub will be when it is milled. Furthermore, there are apparently excellent opportunities for reductions in cost by improved methods of culture, better extraction methods, and by increasing the rubber-producing capacity of the shrub. Such improvements require additional experimental work that is an essential part of a program directed toward lowering substantially guayule rubber production costs.

It has been estimated by a representative of the Office of Rubber Director that crude guayule rubber from cultivated shrub can be produced for about 30 cents per pound in the United States, with farmers growing the shrub on a contract basis and private industry doing the processing, and for less than 20 cents in Mexico. Hazardous a guess, it appears presently that it should be possible to produce guayule rubber in the United States, if work is carried out on a sustained, regular basis, for from 30 to 40 cents per pound.

During the years of 1931, 1934, 1936, and 1941 the Intercontinental Rubber Co. produced 1,370 long tons of rubber from guayule of domestic plantings. This rubber was milled in the Spence factory at Salinas, Calif., which was purchased by the Government in March 1942 for use by the Emergency Rubber Project. The exact cost per pound of producing this rubber was never, to our knowledge, made public by this company, but the following testimony was given by Mr. C. L. Baker, president of the Intercontinental Rubber Co., before the House Committee on Agriculture during hearings on January 8, 1942, on H. R. 6299: "We had planted at one time about 8,000 acres. This whole project contemplated a 30-cent price of rubber or better. When these 8,000 acres were planted, rubber was about 35 cents, and the company thought we were safe in going ahead. When the rubber was ready to harvest the price was 3 cents, and it just knocked the pins out from under us, of course, and we haven't yet had the nerve to tackle it again until we can see some assurance of a price."

A definite cost figure of 12.29 cents per pound is quoted by the then Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower in his confidential Report of Inspection of Guayule-Rubber Industry, dated June 6, 1930. It should be noted that this cost was based on the operation of a very small area, and may not be applicable to operations of the scope proposed under the guayule program. It is evident that the cost of 12.29 cents is very much lower than could be attained under conditions as they now exist. In 1930, unskilled labor was 35 to 40 cents per hour, as against current labor costs in the area under study of 65 to 75 cents per hour. Material costs also were much lower in

1930, and seemingly no overhead costs are included in the above figure.

The emergency rubber project has no official responsibility in operations yielding rubber imports and has no information about costs of imported rubber that could be used to compare with costs of domestic guayule.

QUALITY OF GUAYULE RUBBER

The present milling process is cumbersome and expensive. Improvements were made by the project over the old company methods during the milling of the shrub purchased from the Intercontinental Rubber Co. It has been authoritatively stated that the best crude guayule rubber ever produced was produced at the Spence factory last spring. The primary improvements over old milling practices were, in order of priority:

1. The use of antioxidant as a preservative.
2. Controlled uniform feed to the mills, resulting in uniform milling.
3. Installation of two-worm washing tanks in mill circuit.
4. Carefully controlled drying.

It can be reasonably expected that the present milling process can be greatly simplified and improved upon.

Research studies now under way on extraction methods give considerable promise of developing processes that will improve the quality of the crude rubber, as well as materially reduce extraction costs and equipment requirements.

TOTAL INVESTMENT IN GUAYULE PROJECT

The total amount invested in the guayule project up to October 31, 1943, is approximately \$27,800,000. This includes all expenditures for research and experimentation, as well as approximately \$11,000,000 in capital investments.

SUMMARY ON GUAYULE

For those who are interested in the present cost of guayule rubber and our investment in the venture I enclose a letter which I have received from Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service in the United States Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, November 29, 1943.

Hon. KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STEFAN: During your recent conversation in your office with Mr. Salmond, of this Bureau, he promised to supply additional information concerning the guayule project. Mr. Salmond believes the following information will be of particular interest to you.

The guayule project was initiated by the purchase for \$1,721,235 of the California guayule properties of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. Authorization for this was contained in the legislation authorizing the project. The purchase included 1,483 acres of land, various parts of which were occupied by growing guayule shrub, guayule nurseries, a factory, and miscellaneous administrative and laboratory structures. A portion of the land was used at time of purchase for the production of farm crops. Other items in the purchase included rubber extraction and farm machinery, laboratory equipment, office furniture, water systems, about 550 acres of old overmature shrub, some 117 acres of younger shrub, 22,867 pounds of guayule seed, nearly 19,000,000 seedlings, patents, and experimental and research data.

The 550 acres of shrub, from which 876,200 pounds of rubber was milled, referred to in the enclosure with my letter of November 25, is the same acreage as that listed in the preceding paragraph. The rubber was sold to

the Rubber Reserve Company for \$236,574, which sum reverted to the Treasury. This rubber is all that has been milled from cultivated guayule shrub by the Forest Service. The shrub which has been planted by the Forest Service, beginning in the late spring of 1942, will not be large enough to harvest until late in 1944.

The milling operation currently going on is being supplied with wild shrub from the Big Bend area of Texas. The Texas shrub is the remnant of a native stand of guayule that was harvested in part at different times in the past several decades by private enterprise. The yield of rubber from the scattered shrub now being collected probably will be 150 to 200 tons. This production operation is being financed by funds made available by the Rubber Reserve Company on the basis of actual cost of production. The rubber is turned over to that agency as rapidly as it is produced. The estimated cost of crude guayule rubber obtained from this salvage operation is about 70 cents per pound.

Lands used for growing guayule are leased rather than purchased. No authority for purchasing lands for such a purpose is provided in the guayule enabling act. Some land has been purchased for administrative purposes under specific authority. The exact acreage is not immediately available here. It is minor, and primarily to provide land for the erection of labor camps. Labor camps are used considerably, when not needed for guayule operations, to house persons working on other war activities. Eighteen labor camps of semipermanent type have been constructed. Total capacity of labor camps is about 8,500.

The average annual rental of irrigated lands used for nurseries is approximately \$35.50 per acre. Annual rental of irrigated plantation land averages approximately \$25.50 per acre, for unirrigated land approximately \$7.50 per acre. Values of irrigated lands are \$200-\$600 per acre. Grains and sorghum are principal crops raised on dry lands. Seed crops, sugar beets, tomatoes, peas, lettuce, and various truck crops are grown on irrigated lands, which generally produce more than one crop a year. Nearly all land rented is in California. Rentals in other Southwestern States vary somewhat from California figures; dry and irrigated land in lower Texas being lower, prices for irrigated land in New Mexico and Arizona ranging more nearly at the same general levels as in California.

There are nearly 32,000 acres of guayule plantations. The earliest date on which milling could begin is in the fall of 1944. Should these plantations then be milled at the maximum practicable rate the operation would be terminated by June 1947. It is estimated that from 9,900 to 12,500 tons of rubber should be recovered in this period, the total volume depending on whether maximum rate of production in fiscal years 1945 and 1946 were desired, or a more even spread of production over fiscal years 1945, 1946, and 1947 were preferred. The latter procedure would produce the larger tonnage of rubber and would cost some \$300,000 more; the estimated total cost of the latter plan being about \$54,200,000 for 12,500 tons as against about \$53,900,000 for some 9,900 tons of rubber. The sums stated include all estimated expenditures for the guayule project since its inception, including all research and all expenditures for capital investment. The indicated total cost of rubber per pound for liquidation of the project by either of these plans is \$2.43 for the plan that should produce 9,900 long tons and \$1.94 for the production of 12,500 long tons of rubber.

A liquidation program designed to produce the probable maximum of rubber from about 32,000 acres would begin milling at a slow rate late in 1944, increase the annual pro-

duction rate later, and extend the milling period into 1951. Estimating the probable production of rubber from a large acreage over a period as long as 7 years is hazardous due to the many adverse circumstances that can affect an agricultural crop in that period. Theoretically, it should be possible to produce substantially 29,000 long tons of rubber. It cannot safely be said that such a tonnage would be realized. However, it would cost about \$62,000,000 to carry the project to a termination in 1951, and should 29,000 tons of rubber be produced, a cost of about 95 cents per pound is indicated. This figure, perhaps rounded off to \$1 per pound, might be viewed as the most favorable liquidation cost in terms of cost of rubber per pound that could be reached. Lesser tonnage of rubber produced would mean higher cost per pound.

The discussions of estimated rubber production and liquidation costs above are believed to indicate the approximate ranges within which liquidation of the project would fall if the shrub now planted were harvested and milled.

In making the above calculations, the residual value which might remain at the termination of the enterprise in some thirteen and one-third million dollars worth of capital investment, is ignored.

Very sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS, Chief.

LATIN-AMERICAN RUBBER

Much has been said about our rubber program in Latin America. In reply to a letter which I sent to the Rubber Development Corporation, which is an agency of the United States Government, I have the following reply which gives some information about what the rubber in Latin-American countries may be costing us. I include it in my remarks for the information of the membership of the House:

RUBBER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1943.
The Honorable KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEFAN: We have received copy of a letter addressed to you by Mr. John Caswell of the Rubber Director's Office, dated November 9, 1943, in reply to your letter of October 27. We note that Mr. Caswell has referred to us for answer that portion of your letter requesting information as to the cost of crude rubber obtained from Latin-American countries, including Brazilian rubber and guayule rubber from Mexico.

Rubber Development Corporation has agreements with 16 Latin-American governments for the procurement of crude rubber. These agreements were negotiated in 1942 and end at December 31, 1946. Mr. Caswell has correctly pointed out that it is only proper to judge the cost of rubber from the agreement countries over the full period of the agreements, since it is evident that heavy initial expenditures at the beginning of operations had to be made in order to provide badly needed facilities, transportation, equipment, and supplies for production, labor, etc.

Taking actual expenditures and receipts of rubber to the last available date, plus estimated expenditures and receipts of rubber to December 31 of this year, the total cost of the importation of rubber from April 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, works out at between 90 cents and \$1 per pound.

Estimating the probable imports from the 16 agreement countries for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946 and spreading the presently budgeted expenditures, plus expenditures to date, over the whole period, but leaving out

any recoveries that may be realized by the Corporation in the disposition of capital equipment or in the final liquidation of loans made to producers, the projected cost of imports over the whole period from April 1, 1942, to December 31, 1946, is between 65 and 75 cents per pound.

You will appreciate that the figures given above are our best estimates at the present time and are subject to revision as changed circumstances may, in the future, indicate.

We sincerely trust that the information given will adequately serve your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. BICKNELL,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, is it not true that you can get any old price that seems to strike the mind of the person to whom you are talking. There is nothing whatsoever upon which those people down there can depend to fix a price on rubber because of the uncertain and fantastic sums we are paying the workers of the country. We have carried this to a point that has completely upset their whole economy.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about the difficulty of getting facts and figures. I agree with that.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. In the price of guayule rubber, of which you speak, does not the price also include a considerable amount of research work done and which cannot be estimated in the costs?

Mr. STEFAN. Of course research work is part of the overhead cost.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Paul Roberts is in charge of the planting of guayule rubber plants in California at this time. I have great faith in his ability. He did great work in planting trees and I am sure he will give his best efforts to the work he is now charged with. But so far as the price of guayule rubber is concerned, I cannot talk intelligently about it except to give you information I received from the Forestry Service. But what I want to bring out on the floor of this House is the matter of synthetic rubber in which you and I and the taxpayers of America have \$750,000,000 invested.

There is a philosophy, that after the war we should liquidate the synthetic-rubber plants and again surrender the rubber business in the United States to a monopoly. I believe we are going to be able to compete with raw rubber when the war is over.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman think in the case of guayule that perhaps it might prove feasible later on to have that done through private contract and the guayule grown by private farmers based upon the experience of farmers?

Mr. STEFAN. If you can produce guayule rubber at a fair price I would agree with the gentleman. Certainly I agree with the gentleman if we have an investment of \$28,000,000 in guayule and if there is a possibility of producing raw

rubber from guayule, at a fair price, that investment should be in some way saved to the taxpayers and private industry should be given an opportunity to produce this rubber.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think we should liquidate \$750,000,000 worth of synthetic-rubber plants. We should sell this rubber at a fair price, so that there will be no loss to the Federal Government, and sell the plants to private industry and compete with natural rubber wherever we can. We should protect all of these vast investments of our people's money.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that the expansion of the synthetic-rubber program in the post-war period will make an additional permanent outlet for certain agricultural products and may help to prevent deflation in the agricultural picture?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about it. It will help to solve the so-called surplus of grain; that is why I am so interested in this rubber business. My district and State are agricultural. We want to fit ourselves into the farm chemurgy program in order that we can put to new uses our grain and livestock products. Rubber and industrial alcohol are only a few of the items which we are working on now.

Synthetic rubber made from grain alcohol, according to experiments that have already been made, will result in producing synthetic rubber at a very low price. There is the question of byproducts, which are valuable and which will favorably affect the price.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. Is it not true that synthetic rubber has certain limitations in use for types of tires, and so forth, and has to be mixed with a certain amount of natural rubber which can come from guayule and other sources?

Mr. STEFAN. Not only guayule, but other sources. Experts tell me that the synthetic rubber we are now producing is of fine quality. Experiments will improve it. It is true we have to use a little raw rubber to mix with synthetic rubber. But, we have solved the rubber question. We were up against it before Pearl Harbor. The Japanese took over the rubber plantations from the British and the Dutch, and we could not get raw rubber, so we built synthetic-rubber plants, and we are now making our own rubber. Certainly when the war is over we are not going to junk these valuable plants.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. The philosophy of destroying an industry that has made us already self-sufficient in rubber, a critical material, in my opinion, is wrong.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman stated quite correctly that after Pearl Harbor the greatest source of our rubber supply temporarily disappeared. In the gentleman's opinion, is not our guayule program justified on that basis?

Mr. STEFAN. It was a stand-by or reserve proposition. We had to get rubber from any source we could get it. Guayule was one source. Price was no object. But now we are self-sufficient as far as rubber is concerned. The reason you cannot get an automobile tire whenever you want one is not because of rubber but because of the bottleneck in the tire factories. Manpower, cotton, rayon, and so forth are some reasons, but so far as rubber is concerned, we are now in fine shape, thanks to William Jeffers, the former Rubber Director and his staff of efficient aides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, having been attending the committee hearing, I would like to surrender the time I had reserved for today, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday of this week, after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this time for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders here-

tofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CARE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR

NO. 2

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on Armistice Day, I addressed the House and called to the attention of the membership the procrastination that has been going on in the handling of post-war affairs, as far as men in the armed services are concerned. On that occasion I cited in detail the record of the administration in the handling of veterans' affairs in the past 10 or 11 years. On that occasion I tried to emphasize and point out specifically that the post-war period begins for different people at different times; that the handling of post-war affairs is not a matter for the Congress to delay; that as a matter of fact, many thousands of young men have already entered today what is the post-war period. Those remarks on that occasion seemed to provoke some interest and I want to read today from an editorial from the Chicago American-Herald, which was published November 27, to lend additional emphasis to what this newspaper rather curiously named The Unwanted Battalion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I may extend the entire editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

THE UNWANTED BATTALION

For 600,000 young Americans the post-war period has begun.

They are the men already discharged by the armed forces. For 2,000 other young Americans the post-war period begins each week.

Every hour of the day 12 men are returned to civilian life.

Many of them find families, friends, and jobs awaiting them.

But many—far too many—enjoy no such good fortune.

There are the thousands discharged on psychoneurotic grounds.

There are the thousands discharged for physical unfitness.

There are the thousands discharged for incapability.

There are the thousands discharged for having lost legs, arms, eyes, and stamina.

Only a few months ago these hopeful young men were the flower of American youth.

Through exhaustive physical and mental examinations, which only the best could pass, they were selected for military duty.

Now they are the unwanted battalion.

They are shunted out of hospitals.

They are shunted back to their families.

The Congress says these men ought to have their jobs back in private industry.

Employers generally agree.

But rigid labor standards imposed by safety legislation, insurance regulations, and measures calculated to reduce industrial accidents are an insurmountable barrier to disabled men's reemployment.

Consequently the infirmities which remove soldiers from battle lines also remove them from production lines.

As days become weeks and weeks extend into months, the plight of these veterans is increasingly worse.

Under the Federal law they are entitled to disability compensation. But to get it they must go through voluminous and often costly red tape and then wait 2 to 4 months for the first payment.

Moreover, military regulations compel discharged men to be out of uniform in 90 days.

Unlike even convicts freed from penitentiaries, the soldiers, sailors, and marines who served their country honorably and heroically at home and abroad are not given a suit of clothes at the expiration of their terms. They must obtain their own.

So deplorable is the condition of returning servicemen that patriotic voices everywhere are raised in righteous protest. In Massachusetts, John J. Sawtelle, only Democratic member of the Governor's executive council and the father of a soldier, recently castigated the national Democratic administration of its mistreatment of Second World War veterans.

Mr. Sawtelle said:

"More than 1,500 Massachusetts boys have been discharged from the armed forces as insane and sent home to their families with no real provision having been made for their medical care.

"The national administration is doing nothing for these new war victims.

"I took up the matter of returning boys being discharged as insane with Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK, majority leader in the House of Representatives.

"Mr. McCORMACK said he was shocked at the number. But he was not shocked into doing anything about it.

"Beyond promises and empty words, nothing has as yet been done for these unfortunate lads.

"It is about time the Government of the Nation stopped spending \$15,000,000,000 on housing projects of questionable value and transformed those housing units into veterans' hospitals."

In Washington, speaking on an Armistice Day program, Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri, said:

"The political record of the President of these United States in regard to the war veterans is a shame in the eyes of the Nation.

"The political record of the majority Members of Congress to provide aid and sustenance for the men and women returning from this bloody war is a shame.

"The procrastination of the Democratic leaders of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives is a shame."

Then Mr. PLOESER cited a specific case.

He told of a young man who had lost his right leg in the battle of Tunisia. After a period of hospitalization in the Army's Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C., this young man was discharged. For him the post-war period was grim indeed.

The young man lacked money for food and shelter. He lacked money for railroad fare to his home. He lacked money for the civilian clothes which military regulations forced him to obtain.

Before this young man went to war he had worked on a farm in Kentucky.

But now he could no longer walk behind a plow because he had lost a leg in the service of his country.

At various times, before his enlistment in the Army, he had worked for a building contractor.

But never again could he climb ladders or move about roofs. The young man was truly hapless and helpless.

Finally, a kind-hearted woman in Washington gave him a temporary place to stay in her home.

She took him to the Veterans' Bureau, where he received assurance that his case would be adjudicated as rapidly as possible, which meant 60 days and perhaps a hundred and twenty days.

The woman then took the disabled soldier to various Members of Congress and demanded action.

Not all the veterans of this war will find good Samaritans to mother them and sponsor their cases.

Veterans, and particularly disabled veterans, must have the protection and benefits of adequate laws passed by their Congress and approved by their President.

Promises will not rehabilitate veterans sick in body and mind, or fill their empty stomachs.

America, which does not hesitate to give billions to foreign governments, should not hesitate to give something to her own disabled sons.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, very recently the national commander of the American Legion made a hurried survey of conditions as they exist throughout the United States. I have here the statement made by Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, on results of the survey of World War No. 2 claims. It is dated December 2. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend it in the RECORD at this particular point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY WARREN H. ATHERTON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON RESULTS OF SURVEY OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 CLAIMS

DECEMBER 2, 1943.

A telegraphic and air-mail survey of American Legion service officers on pending World War No. 2 claims show that there has been and still is considerable delay from the time these men are released from service, file their claims, and receive the first check in settlement thereof. This delay is attributable to a number of circumstances, according to these service officers. Some States report no undue delay, but most of them have cases of record filed 3 to 7 months ago and not yet settled. The American Legion feels that all Government agencies concerned should coordinate their activities to the end that men and women released from service because of disabilities shall not be subjected to inconvenience, embarrassment, and at times distress because their claims for disability compensation are not settled promptly. The American Legion has clearly in mind that a great number of these claimants have been in service for several months, have become incapacitated in training or combat, and are now back in civil life or back in hospitals and institutions because the armed services have no further use for them. While they were in they made allotments to their dependents to which was added the Government allowance. This benefit is discontinued in each case upon discharge. Having no other income the disabled dischargee must rely on financial assistance from private or charitable sources. Such a situation, especially for the combat disabled, should not be tolerated. Based upon the findings of the survey just completed, and upon the experience of the organization in claims and rehabilitation fields, the following recommendations are made by the American Legion to the Federal Government:

1. Every serviceman whose disabilities or physical condition are reparable should be retained in the armed services to receive the

maximum benefits of hospital and medical care. If there is need for further convalescent or institutional care the liaison between the Army and Navy on the one hand, and the Veterans' Administration on the other, should really function and be applicable in each case. Men should not be returned to civil or State authorities unless so desired expressly by the folks at home.

2. The Veterans' Administration hospital-bed capacity, especially for the nervous and mental cases and the tuberculous patients, should be enlarged so that all those released from service and in need of further care may be accommodated. The American Legion is committed to the proposition that the Veterans' Administration be a war agency for the duration of hostilities and 6 months thereafter, to assure its proper place in the priorities rating for construction material, equipment, personnel, and supplies.

3. As a direct contribution to the informational and advisory service to prospective dischargees the Veterans' Administration should have contact representatives at the larger discharge centers especially those holding combat troops.

4. To obviate delays in adjudicating claims for obvious and indisputable disabilities the War and Navy Departments should permit the assignment of Veterans' Administration rating boards at the larger discharge points or demobilization centers.

5. Mustering-out pay in amounts dependent upon length of service should be made available with a portion payable at discharge and the balance within 30 to 60 days thereafter. The national commander of the American Legion testified before a Senate committee on such a proposal December 1, 1943.

6. The furnishing of medical and clinical records from service hospitals at which the disabled person may have been treated before he reached the discharge center must be speeded up. It is understood that such records may be essential in the adjudication of many cases, but in many others they would contribute little or nothing to the identification and evaluation of the disability causing discharge. Another bottle neck was found in the furnishing of photostat copies of induction or enlistment examination reports. As the result of a former survey made by the American Legion, the War Department was furnished with findings upon which officials took action: It has been reported that this bottleneck is now eliminated and that requests for these photostat records will be handled within 5 days from date of receipt.

7. The present arrangement of sending records and reports of disabled dischargees to the nearest regional office of the Veterans' Administration should be changed so that these records are dispatched promptly to the Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction in the man's home State. This change may require Veterans' Administration contact people at the different discharge points as recommended above.

8. The lack of sufficient trained personnel in the adjudication field is a cause of delay in handling these cases in most stations. The manpower situation is recognized, but yet the Legion cannot refrain from urging and exhorting the Veterans' Administration to authorize the additional help requested by field offices, and to immediately step up recruitment and training programs for this purpose.

9. Some service officers have reported that the lack of complete and clarifying instructions from the central office of the Veterans' Administration to the regional offices on the adjudication of the new claims has been an element of delay. Certainly this should be overcome immediately.

10. Each claim is assigned a "C" number. So far this is done by the central office. Complaints have come in that the delay in assigning these numbers has held up adjudication.

cation of cases for as long as 2 or 3 weeks. The Legion feels this is an administrative problem that could and should be met and solved right now.

11. The present fiscal arrangement whereby disbursement on vouchers and rolls certified by the Veterans' Administration are made at disbursing offices, one in each Federal Reserve district, also contributes to delay the issuance of the initial check and settlement of the claim. Up to about 8 years ago the Veterans' Administration had its own disbursing officers. Reverting to that arrangement now should serve to expedite the payment of individual and new claims.

These conclusions rest upon observations sent in by trained service officers in 34 States. They cited by name and number (if assigned) 1,535 cases of disabled men. It is understood that many cases may require development of pertinent information, but that should not be permitted to slow down the whole rating machinery. Another factor cited is that of settling the question of waiver of premiums on insurance during period of total disability. Also the payment of insurance benefits and pension to the dependents of those dying in service. The jurisdiction over both these is in central office, and the many delays reported call for prompt improvement in the system of disposing of these cases.

There may be many other considerations touching upon the broad question of delays in the settlement of disabled veterans' claims. The American Legion submits, however, that if all Government agencies concerned would redouble their efforts to effect complete coordination much will have been accomplished toward the goal sought by the discharges themselves, their folks at home, their representatives, and the Federal Government.

Attached hereto are brief summaries of cases taken from those submitted in the survey. They illustrate many of the points set forth above.

Related to this question are those other important programs of employment and unemployment protection. As to these the American Legion has proposals which are being introduced in Congress and on which further detailed data will be given.

Mr. PLOESER. It is interesting to learn that the results of this survey brought back a report on conditions which cited 1,535 cases of disabled men. I shall read from this report. It seemed that in this report were recorded many cases of extreme delay in the handling of disabled veterans' claims. I have here in my possession some specific cases and I am going to read some of them to the House:

Case 1: In this claim the veteran served honorably in the Navy from March 4, 1932, to February 8, 1938. He reenlisted on May 4, 1938, and was honorably discharged on medical certificate on account of active tuberculosis, incurred in line of duty, on April 6, 1943. The Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on April 21, 1943, and it has not been adjudicated as yet on account of the fact that complete records have not been received from the Navy. Contact was made with the adjudication officer about the delay in this claim on October 22, 1943, and again on November 29, 1943.

Case 2: This veteran was discharged insane, unable to sign his discharge. Claim was filed April 12 and we have not yet been able to get this veteran examined. While it is true that the Veterans' Administration wrote to the sister and a service officer, no letters were written to either or anyone in the months of September and October. Request was made for an attendant by this office on August 2 and the Veterans' Admin-

istration under date of November 9 finally complied with this request and wrote the veteran.

Case 3: This boy enlisted on July 13, 1940, and was declared unfit for service on January 13, 1943, with this notation: "Patient was struck in the head while in combat against the Japanese on Guadalcanal, penetrating wound right parieto-occipital region produced by grenade. Diagnosis: Hemiplegia, spastic, left." He was honorably discharged on C. D. D. July 3, 1943, and his claim was filed the same date. He was rated 50 percent disabled October 25, 1943, and advised of this rating on November 4, 1943, with rating effective from July 5, 1943. Vocational rehabilitation recommended.

Case 4: Claim was filed in this case July 3. The case file was transferred to central office for consideration by the Veterans' Claims Service on October 6, 1943. One reason for the delay in this particular case is that the veteran had a claim pending for officers' retirement pay which had to be disposed of.

Case 5: This claimant was discharged from the hospital on August 16, 1943, and on November 11, 1943, an office of the Veterans' Administration had to make a second request of the War Department for a medical report. He was examined at a Veterans' Administration hospital and some adjustment was made.

Case 6: This claimant was discharged August 15, 1942, from the Army Nurse Corps, and claim was filed February 4, 1943. Reports from the Adjutant General's Office, for which requests had been made several times, were not received until the latter part of August 1943. The decision has been deferred until completion of the requested neuropsychiatric examination by the Veterans' Administration.

Case 7: This veteran was discharged from service July 27, 1943, with a diagnosis of dementia praecox, paranoid. The handicap estimated by the rating board is 100 percent. Action toward releasing payment on the veteran's behalf apparently is not to be expected until the facility is informed officially with respect to the character of the veteran's discharge. It seems quite evident that this veteran served honorably, but the authorization unit has refused to release the payments until officially reported that discharge was honorable.

Case 8: Discharge from service in this case was effected July 26, 1943. Decision by the rating board on October 7, 1943, recognized the veteran's entitlement to pensionable rating for weak feet. Release of payments in this case, as in the case to which reference is made immediately above, awaits the receipt of official information of the man having been discharged honorably.

Case 9: Claim for pension was filed by this veteran at the time of discharge on June 11, 1943. Order for examination was issued by the rating board July 30, 1943. Before conducting the studies the medical authorities thought it advisable to have a social-service investigation made. It seems probable that another 3 or 4 months will elapse before a decision can be effected in the circumstances that exist, due to the accumulated load and number of orders for investigations.

Case 10: Claim was filed June 17, 1943. Several follow-ups by a Veterans' Administration facility have not brought the receipt of War Department reports.

Case 11: This veteran enlisted October 25, 1941, and was honorably discharged on C. D. D., December 23, 1942. Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on January 4, 1943. On January 5, 1943, service records were requested from The Adjutant General's office and were received in this office on February 19, 1943. Under date of April 10, 1943, the rating board requested supplemental service records from The Adjutant General's office, which were received in the Veterans' Administration on

May 7, 1943. A second supplemental Adjutant General's report concerning alleged treatment at Fort Custer was requested May 10, 1943, and on June 14, 1943, a third supplemental report of clinical records of treatment at Fort Custer was requested. Complete records of the claimant's treatment at Fort Custer were received in the Veterans' Administration on July 26, 1943. August 3, 1943, an examination and psychiatric social history were requested by the rating board and the latter was received on September 12, 1943. Then, on September 14, 1943, the rating board requested an examination based upon psychiatric social report. The claimant was examined at a Veterans' Administration facility on October 14, 1943, and report of this was received November 15, 1943, in the regional office. On November 20, 1943, the rating board rated the claim and granted service connection for a nervous condition, incompetent and in need of a guardian. On account of the claimant's having been declared incompetent, chief attorney requested that a fiduciary be appointed under date of November 24, 1943. No check has been issued as yet.

Case 12: In this case the veteran, totally blind, was discharged from an Army hospital on June 30, 1943; the Army service records were not received in the regional office until the week of November 22, 1943; therefore the veteran has not as yet, and probably will not for 30 days, receive the pension check to which he is entitled.

Case 13: This veteran was discharged from service March 31, 1943. Form 526 was submitted to the Veterans' Administration on August 9, 1943. The regional office has only a dummy file on this case. The principal folder was sent to the Index Division, Office of Chief Clerk, on August 9, 1943, for the reason that, in addition to the veteran's service in the Navy in World War No. 2, he had also had peacetime service in the Army, just prior to World War No. 2. Under date of September 14, 1943, the chief clerk advised the regional office that the veteran's file was being referred to the insurance claims council for attention to the veteran's claim for waiver of premiums.

Case 14: This veteran was discharged from service on March 4, 1943. He has been granted service connection for tuberculosis, pulmonary, active, under date of May 5, 1943, and has been rated 100 percent from March 5, 1943. His claim file was sent to the Director of Insurance on September 25, 1943 for action on a question of entitlement to waiver of premiums. The file has not been returned to this date, November 26, 1943, and no action has been reported by the insurance claims council.

Case 15: A recent survey of State hospitals for the insane in northern California alone showed 100 discharged veterans of World War No. 2 being confined therein because of lack of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

The point I make now is, and the point I made on November 11 was, that it is highly important that this Congress provide some sort of program which will bridge the gap when these men are discharged from the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PLOESER. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. As I pointed out a while ago there is pending House Resolution 29 to amend the rules so as to give the Veterans' Committee jurisdiction of this legislation. There is a petition on the desk, petition No. 8, which Members

of the House are asked to sign in order to bring that rule before the House for consideration to clear up this question of jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Missouri has not signed it. I hope while he has his mind on the subject he will sign it and help us bring that legislation out and straighten out this question of jurisdiction.

Mr. PLOESER. Can my distinguished friend from Mississippi tell me whether that would develop the rule in such way that legislation similar to that which I introduced a year ago last October to extend the pay of these men in the service so as to bridge the gap between their dismissal from service and their economic rehabilitation would be considered by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. RANKIN. When the rule is amended we propose to have it cover also rehabilitation.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to be sure about it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri cannot be sure until the rule is brought out. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have taken as much abuse because of my sympathy for the veterans and my work here in their behalf as any man in Congress. I have been chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for 13 years and have done everything I could to take care of these disabled veterans. I have tried to get this rule adopted to give us this jurisdiction to do whatever is necessary to help. Frankly, I do not remember ever having seen the gentleman from Missouri before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation asking for the passage of legislation.

Mr. PLOESER. That is very true; the legislation introduced by me is before the Committee on Military Affairs. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the gentleman has been distinguished in his service to the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. I would not say that.

Mr. PLOESER. I am one of his great admirers for the service he has rendered to the veterans over the many years. I do make the point, however, that there seems to be a deliberate procrastination in some of the recesses of the House of Representatives because one simply cannot get action on any sort of bill which will bring out an extended pay program for these men. I do not know whether that type of legislation directly belongs before the gentleman's committee or not.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri can help to alleviate that procrastination by signing this petition and helping us to amend the rules.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Missouri is not a habitual signer of petitions.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not ask him to make it a habit, but he has made it a habit to criticize veterans' legislation. I thought he would not mind putting his name on the dotted line and helping us to alleviate some of the conditions of which he complains. The veterans remember the old saying, "By their works ye shall know them."

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman had been listening to what I said, or if the gentleman had been on the floor of the House and heard the remarks I made on November 11, the gentleman would know I have not been criticizing veterans' legislation. I have been criticizing the entire policy of the Democratic Party in this House for delaying a comprehensive over-all post-war program for the veterans of this war. So far as legislation for disabled veterans is concerned, I am not criticizing the law, neither am I criticizing the Veterans' Administration, as I have tried to make clear in these remarks today. I think I know from experience that with such a tremendous and voluminous mass of detail there are bound to be delays, slips and errors in a great many cases. I am stating that there is a way for this Congress to bridge the gap so that such a slip cannot be fatal to the individual veteran. I am not sure that this legislation belongs before the gentleman's committee. If he can assure me that this rule he now wants will definitely bring that type of legislation before his committee, I would feel right at home. There I should get action.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman realizes, however, he has not got action otherwise?

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman not only realizes that fact but he deplors the political procrastination he is getting from other sources.

Mr. RANKIN. It does not sound very well to hear one allege that this delay is caused by political procrastination. We have Democrats and Republicans on the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and I challenge any of them to show where we have had any politics in that committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Why does the gentleman insist on taking the burden of this accusation unto himself? I am not accusing the gentleman or his committee of procrastination.

Mr. RANKIN. I fear the gentleman from Missouri has got himself in an embarrassing position. He has shown that he has not done anything to help us straighten out this jurisdictional question.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Mississippi well knows that under the rules of the House the legislation which I have introduced does not go to the gentleman's committee and did not go to his committee, and that the committee it is before has procrastinated, either deliberately or through a lack of interest. Why, the leadership of the House has brought no definite program before this body to take care of these men, and I have every right to accuse them of political procrastination as long as they do not act. I am not accusing the gentleman's committee of political division. I do not think it has been guilty of that. This legislation is not before the gentleman's committee. Why should he feel as though he should have to take the burden of guilt upon himself? I did not invite him to.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman is complaining of conditions which he says

exists, and I have pointed out to him a way to help relieve the situation.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman knows me well enough during the time I have been here to know that he could not in his heart or mind believe that I had such a thought about him.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri is standing there now complaining, when other Members on his own side of the House have signed this petition to straighten out this jurisdictional matter in order that we may move forward with veterans' legislation. This is the second time he has taken the floor, while other Members on his own side have signed this petition.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman assure me that the petition will bring before the House this particular bill he is talking about?

Mr. RANKIN. I think it will.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say one thing, if this rule is passed in the form we are going to ask for its passage, it will give this committee jurisdiction over rehabilitation of these veterans.

Mr. PLOESER. Will it give them the jurisdiction over extended pay?

Mr. RANKIN. That is rehabilitation, is it not?

Mr. PLOESER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that I do not know whether you would technically call it that under the rules or not.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that would be called rehabilitation.

Mr. PLOESER. I will say this to the gentleman: I introduced this bill in October 1942 and reintroduced it again in 1943, the early part of this year. I rewrote the title to the bill deliberately to try to get it before the gentleman's committee. There is where I would like the bill to be. If I think the gentleman's petition will do it, I will gladly sign it, but I have no assurance that it will. If it does not, then I think the gentleman should revise the petition so that it would. I know of no more friendly place to go with a veteran's matter than the gentleman's committee, and I want the distinguished gentleman to know that I feel that way about it and about him.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman does a violent injustice to the Members of this House when he accuses any of them of political procrastination as far as the disabled veterans are concerned, because I do not believe that statement has any foundation of fact whatsoever. I do not believe there is anybody on either side of this House who does not want to do what is necessary for the veterans.

Mr. PLOESER. The distinguished gentleman is talking about something I have not said. I did not say they were procrastinating on disabled veterans' legislation. I said they were procrastinating on an over-all post-war plan for all veterans. The law now provides for disabled veterans. As I said, and as the gentleman well knows I said, I want something to "bridge the gap." All we have had out of this administration and

all we have had on this entire matter is lip service.

I tried to amend the dependency allowance bill before this House a few weeks ago by inserting a provision to make a pay extension to these veterans, and I did not succeed in doing it. I tried to get before the gentleman's committee this very legislation that is before the Committee on Military Affairs. I did not succeed in doing it. If the gentleman can guarantee or assure me conscientiously that this petition of his will do it, I will join him and fight with him to the very end of the road. I did not accuse the gentleman of any such thing and he well knows it. Let not the gentleman get himself involved in a place of guilt where he does not belong.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Mississippi is able to take care of himself in this House at any time.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Missouri will take care of himself without any assistance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If this bill provided that the expenses should be borne by the Veterans' Administration, would it not then go to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for action?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that, not having the terms of the bill before him, it is very hard to answer a question of that sort.

Mr. PLOESER. For the information of the Chair and for the information of the distinguished gentlewoman, I may say that the bill does not provide that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; but I say, if the bill did provide that, would it go to that committee?

Mr. PLOESER. I do not think that would be a proper bill. A bill which charged up to the Veterans' Administration the expenses of extended pay to men who are 100 percent physically and mentally able I think would be improperly placed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was simply trying to see if we could get action at once on it. The gentleman has done a very aggressive piece of work, and I heartily commend him for it.

Mr. PLOESER. I appreciate the fine words of the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we have passed laws for the disabled, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. However, the Veterans' Administration has been absolutely asleep, and the laws have not been carried out.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentlewoman knows I have voted for all such bills.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it intended that the overlapping pay shall be continued for those who have been wounded or incapacitated until the matter has been cleared up by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. PLOESER. According to my bill, the pay would be extended. In my original bill I called for 15 months. I am not one to say that 15 months is the proper time. It may be 12 months, or longer; I do not know. That is something we shall have to decide. It would be a guaranteed minimum pay. If he had an earned income in addition to that, it would be deductible according to the procedure which I have outlined in the bill. This bill is in no sense a bonus or a gift, it is a measure to rehabilitate all of them.

In the case of the disabled veteran, this is how it would work. He would be receiving this extended or "bridging the gap" pay until he got his disability compensation. That gap, which is frequently 30, 60, 90, or 120 days, would be bridged by extended pay allowances in the meantime. He would suffer no penalty against his other disability compensation.

Mr. ROWE. Under the present situation, he is just suspended without earnings?

Mr. PLOESER. That is right. I say again that you cannot charge all of that neglect to the Veterans' Administration, if you can charge any.

In an operation of that size involving such a voluminous amount of detail, there is bound to be delay on certain items. There is bound to be error. I am fully aware of that. I say this, there is a way of bridging that gap. If pay is extended automatically the minute a man is discharged from the service the gap is bridged. The President chooses to call it muster-out pay. A year ago I chose to call it extended pay. I am not so sure it might not better be named "bridging the gap" pay.

My original explanation was not designed necessarily to have any particular effect on disabled veterans. It was with reference to all veterans. I want them all to have that gap bridged so that they can have an opportunity to go back into civilian life without being penalized and so they can go back and have decent, respectable jobs. If they happen to be disabled and are entitled to disability compensation, this operates effectively because, during the time of adjudication, they would receive this compensation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield for a brief question, but not for a speech.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not true that only disabled men are being discharged now? Only men who are entitled to disability compensation are being discharged now and the only ones who are calling for our aid are disabled men?

Mr. PLOESER. That is not true. That is not true. I read in the newspaper yesterday where the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs explained on behalf of the Army

that some 25,000 officers would be retired in one way or another.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not want to extend their pay, does he?

Mr. PLOESER. My original bill extended very briefly their pay.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going to extend the pay of 25,000 officers—many of them swivel-chair officers that the Army found they did not need after they got them into the service—

Mr. PLOESER. I am not talking about that. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. I wish he would speak on his own time as is customary.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be glad to speak.

Mr. PLOESER. I will say this to the gentleman. There are a lot of them being dismissed who are not swivel-chair operators. How about the men who are over 33 years of age who have been dismissed?

Mr. RANKIN. The men over 33 years of age, if they are disabled, are taken care of.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman please understand I am not alone talking about disabled veterans. Please stop twisting the situation. I yield no further to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is trying to get away from the point. If he really wants to help the veterans, there is a way to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will please state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to inquire if Members should address the Chair before speaking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the customary procedure.

Mr. PLOESER. For the further benefit of the gentleman who has tried to twist this thing and take the blame upon himself, which he does not deserve, because of his distinguished service to veterans, particularly disabled veterans, I want to say again, here is a list which I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. This is a list of horrible cases in which there is delay in adjudication. There may be many reasons for that delay which are perfectly justifiable; I do not know. But I say this. There is no excuse to leave those men stranded during that period of delay. It is within the power of this Congress to bridge that gap. If that action is not forthcoming soon before this House, I will not be the only one to accuse the majority in this House of political procrastination or purposeful delay. The entire American people will accuse them of purposeful delay. I cannot understand why during the year 1943, we cannot have action on these matters. Why do we have to wait until the summer of 1944 or even the spring? Can it be the election in 1944 has something to do with it? That is a question that I might ask any of the gentlemen

of the majority. I say this to you, that the minority side stands ready, I believe, certainly speaking for myself, I stand ready to go to bat all the way to get a constructive post-war measure through this House which will provide for the easing back into private life the men who come out of the service. I prefer to call it "bridging-the-gap legislation" which will take them over that period in which they have no money; they have no job; and in a great many instances are disabled, with their claims in adjudication.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use that time which I did not use a while ago, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include newspapers articles and a letter from Chester Bowles and a reply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program of the day and any business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the House earlier in the day several Members have had something to say about the statement issued by a Government bureau or agency to the effect that the farmers in Ohio and Michigan should have some Japanese sent to them to teach them how to farm, how to pack their fruit, and how to take a bath—wash themselves—not their clothing. In the first place I cannot get very greatly excited over that, because almost everyone who lives in this country knows that the people of Ohio and Michigan—and I am not saying this now for election purposes—are of the salt of the earth. How often they bathe, I do not know. I well recall my earlier days when I took a bath first in the old wooden washtub. Later on, when we got improvements, in the galvanized-iron washtub. We got the water hot by putting it on top of the stove, and finally, when mother and father got enough money we had a stove with a reservoir in the back and we heated the water there.

We did not have Sweetheart soap, which was supposed to be advertised by the First Lady of the Land before she went on this trip where she saw so many of the unwashed. We had soft soap. We made it in a big copper kettle out in the back yard. We had fats and ashes and lye, and we made crocks of soft soap, and we used it—to wash. I would say to some of the folks who use Sweetheart or Lux that if you really want to get the dirt off get a handful of good home-made old-fashioned soft soap. You can get into a wood tub or a tin tub or a galvanized-iron tub or a pink or blue or yellow marble tub, but you will not get any cleaner than you will if you take soft soap and the old wooden tub. Try it sometime. I would be willing to wager that Ickes' tub down in the Interior Building serves no more useful purpose than does the wash tub still in use on some farms.

Here is the point of the whole thing: Why say that our people are of good habits? Why say they are good farmers? Do our farmers need a defense from the charges, the insinuations of a bureaucrat? They need protection from the new dealers' fool rules and orders, but they need no defense from professors' innuendoes. Out in the Middle West is the breadbasket of the Nation—Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Why they left out Indiana and Illinois folks, the people of Iowa and Kansas, I do not know. Maybe that fellow who wrote that little piece did not know there were such States as Indiana or Illinois, or these other States named, or that there are such people as those who live there. His statement makes me think of Harry Hopkins. Do you remember what Harry said. He said: "People are too damned dumb to understand." Then you remember this other man—this other fellow; excuse me—Winchell; Walter, who has done more to bring discredit upon his race than all the anti-Semitic organizations or individuals in the whole United States. By that chatter of his, by the falsehoods, by the abuse, which he puts on the air and in the papers, he is, week after week, building up race prejudice where none existed. The wonder to me is that the concern which makes a product like Jergen's Lotion can employ him, when he does so much harm, when he does so much to create dislike of the race to which he belongs. Walter, you know, had something to say on a line similar to what Harry Hopkins said. There is a little group all of whom seem to have taken the same sort of mental bath; all have the same ideas. All seem to think the American people west of the eastern mountains are dumb, ignorant, lacking in every good thought and deed. They just make themselves ridiculous, and, were it not for their malice, we should pity them.

I asked the Navy to report on what Walter said in a certain broadcast. The Navy sent up an official report, and I am now reading from page 3:

Walter Winchell was an officer of the United States Naval Reserves, with the rank of lieutenant commander, on active duty on January 31, 1943. According to the transcript given of his broadcast at 9 o'clock p. m., over the Blue Network on that date, he made the following statement—

Listen to this and keep in mind Harry Hopkins' statement that we are all too damn dumb; keep in mind the statement that we ought to have the Japs sent into Ohio and Michigan to teach us how to keep clean and note the thought that runs through all this. Here is what Walter said:

You bet. I am prejudiced against those in high office who guessed so wrong before Pearl Harbor.

Now I heard the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. RAMSPECK, this morning. I like his criticism. It is always instructive. It always encourages a fellow to think to have something to say in reply either by way of contradiction or agreement. A lot of people made mistakes before Pearl Harbor. It seems a little useless for the pot to call the kettle black. The point I was trying to make this morning was this, that no matter what the President had been given, these white papers now disclose that the State Department had warned that the Japs were about to attack. I put in the RECORD myself a dispatch from a correspondent in China filed there the day before Pearl Harbor, in the afternoon, which called attention to the fact that the Japs were going to attack the next day. How that correspondent ever got it over there and sent it to the Chicago Daily News—not the Chicago Tribune, but the Chicago Daily News—I do not know; but there it was. So, no matter what they had, no matter who was to blame for what they did not have, the fact remains that the Army and the Navy were caught napping over there, and that the administration, the Commander in Chief, did not insist that the proper precautions be taken to meet the Japs who were coming.

Now, that is the way it was. That is the way it is. We never yet have been permitted to learn through court martial or inquiry or other proceedings who was to blame. And except as we can profit because of the knowledge of why it happened, an inquiry will be useless.

I might agree with the gentleman from Georgia and with many others as to where the responsibility rests. That makes little difference now, and as far as I am concerned, I would say nothing about it were it not for the fact that every once in a while somebody on the majority side of the aisle pops up and says: "Well, you did not vote for the fortification of Guam; you did not vote for this; you did not vote for that." As we all know—there is no question about it—the President did not ask to have Guam fortified and I know the record will show he did not. The record will show that those in the administration made just as many mistakes as did some of us—were as wrong in their conclusions—as were we on the legislative side. When the administration and the administration's spokesmen, as they did in a number of debates, on the repeal of the neutrality legislation and the transfer of the destroyers and all that, told us that if we would just do this, that, and the other everything would come out all right and there would not be any war, our men would not be sent across if the legislation they sought was enacted. But the

war came just the same. Now because circumstances have changed, because things are entirely different and we are in the conflict, it would be a good thing for everyone if we could forget all about those things, but charges get tossed back and forth across the aisle as much from that side as from this side. After the war is over will be time enough to determine who was mistaken. But I for one do not propose to let unfounded charges go unanswered.

Getting back to what Walter said. I quote:

They're still guessing wrong and not in the least affected by their confessions of ignorance.

Now listen to this:

What worries me most are all those damn fools who elected them.

Now, Winchell was speaking of the American people just as was Hopkins, just as this professor was speaking of the people of Ohio and Michigan, and you will recall Walter was referring to the election of 1942. He was referring to the election where there were more Republican votes cast than there were Democratic or New Deal votes combined. Millions of his fellow countrymen are so described by him. And Jergens expects the people of Ohio and Michigan to buy a product advertised by Winchell. The thing that worries Walter is all the damn fools, as he called them, who elected not only the Republicans on this side but the Members on that side. Now what do you think of a man—what do you think of any individual who will talk that way about the American people?

And then along comes this fellow—I do not know who he is—and he says we should have some Japs sent to the farmers of Ohio and Michigan to teach us how to farm, how to pick and pack our fruit, and how to wash up and get clean.

Mr. RAMEY. He was head of the poultry division of the extension service in Ohio State University, and by some persons he was called a professor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Ohio says that this man used to be a professor at Ohio State University but is now in the employ of the Federal Government. There you have it: Harry Hopkins who says we are too dumb to understand, next Walter who says that our people, millions of them, are damn fools, and this fellow who thinks we do not know enough to take a bath. All paid by the people they condemn—all on the Federal pay roll. The last elections, especially where Long John was engineer, show that the people are beginning to understand and evaluate Walter and Harry.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. I should like to ask for information as to how clean the farmers of Michigan are, for I can tell the gentleman something for the sake of comparison as to how these Japs live in California.

When they move into a locality to raise farm produce and sell it at such a low price in order to run the rest of the

farmers out of business, after which they, of course, increase prices, they live in huts and hovels, two or three families in each. I have seen them myself.

I wish to ask the gentleman if the farmers in Michigan are still worse off than that, that these Japs can teach them anything? Please answer that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will not answer that question; everybody knows our people. There are none better, none cleaner physically, morally, spiritually, mentally, than the folks of the Midwest. Why, do you not know, do you not know that these bureaucrats—and I imagine this professor from Cleveland too—depends on our farmers, for the food they eat, for the milk they drink, for the butter they eat, for the beef and pork that keeps them alive. These fellows would starve to death, they would shrivel up and blow away if it were not for the farmers in the great Midwest. I am not here defending the farmers of Michigan or Ohio; that is not necessary. What I am trying to do now is call attention to the mental quirks that these fellows had, and have, Hopkins, and Winchell, and this Weiss, or whoever he may be—I do not know what his name is. I do not know whether those three fellows belong in a home for the feeble-minded or in an institution where they treat the insane or the psychopathic cases. They belong somewhere outside of the group which is made up of real Americans.

I cannot get excited about being charged with not taking a bath. If I do not take a bath you know it. What of it? People will advise me.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even the people of the South, even the people in Texas, in Tupelo—I see the gentleman on his feet—I have been down there.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker; Tupelo is not in Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I mean Mississippi, Mississippi. I have been down there in that courthouse just before you had those strikes that closed up your industries. You said you were not going to let them in there but they came in and closed your cotton mills for you. They wash down there and they do not go clear down to the Gulf to do it either. I can tell from the looks of those I saw and those with whom I have conversed, and in conversations I have had with the gentleman from Mississippi, that they wash in his district; that they are like our people clean, clear thinking, alert, patriotic Americans full of good sense and sound judgment. It is silly for a man to talk as did Spending Harry, Smearer Walter or the professor who does not know his Ohio or Michigan.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to know first if the gentleman wants to talk about Willkie or whether he wants to talk about T. V. A. or about this advice on bathing?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I cannot talk about those two in the same breath.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that this crazy crackpot who advocates having the Japs teach the people of the Middle West how to bathe and keep clean was a professor or is a professor in some college up there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] advises me that he is a former professor of the University of Ohio.

Mr. RANKIN. They got rid of him of course?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes?

Mr. RAMEY. Now he is on the Federal pay roll as a War Relocation director receiving a salary of \$3,800 per year. He is on leave from Ohio State University. Ohio State University is a great institution being properly administered by good and reliable persons so his leave will likely be permanent.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So much for that. The statement that gentleman sent out just discloses his ignorance, it just discloses his conceit, it just discloses the idea that they have here in Washington that they know more about everything than the people who are actually doing the things back home. That is what it shows. What we need is not a washing in Michigan; not more perfumed bath water. We need a washing out of the New Deal dirty linen down here, a cleaning out of the minds or the brains or the wheels that go around in the heads of these starry-eyed, fuzzy-wuzzy professors. We want to get back here in Washington to good, straight, sound ideas and practices that our people have had and used for a long time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to point out to the gentleman from Michigan after what he has exposed here today about this crank trying to have the Japs teach the people of the Middle West how to wash up and clean up there is the additional danger of having crackpots like that trying to run our elections from Washington. That is one reason the Senate adopted the substitute for the so-called Lucas-Worley bill on last Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman, and may I say further I have voted with you gentlemen who believe in States' rights. What gets me, though, is why you will not go along with us sometimes and get rid of some of these fellows like Harry and this professor. Get them off the pay roll. You are assured of reelection. Every single Democratic Congressman from the South is solid down there. He will be reelected and come back. You have the majority. You have control of legislation. So why do

you not help us clean house at the other end of the Avenue, why do you not go along with us? You are doing a good job handling Wendell Willkie. Why do you not turn on your own party and give your own party a cleaning up? I do not mean the Democrats. I mean the new dealers, the Communists who have stolen your national party machinery. The President's Harry and Willkie have similar ideas, only one of them thinks he can give it away quicker than the other. Willkie thinks he can give it away faster than the President. Before you know it, they will both be running for president of the world.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that I voted to strike from the pay roll every person the Dies committee found to be subversive, and I expect to continue that policy as long as I am a Member of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So did I. That is good. That is going part way. But what will the New Deal crowd do to that act of Congress?

If you go the rest of the way and give the New Deal "heck" all the way down the line, we will get somewhere, in spite of the statement over at the other side of the Capitol that we, the Democrats and Republicans, made an unholy alliance to defeat legislation which would have deprived the servicemen of an opportunity to cast a vote for State and county officers. You and I know that is not true. If there is any alliance, it is one that comes about because we are for America when it comes to the question of what is right and decent.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, the trouble is that when we attempt to help you out you go the wrong way. Now, for instance, you have had a relapse on that subject recently.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On what?

Mr. RANKIN. On canceling the invitation to Mr. Sparks to come down and give you some real information on Willkie, nominated at Philadelphia in 1940.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On what? Be specific now, as Chester Bowles says.

Mr. RANKIN. This man Sparks, a former mayor of Akron, Ohio.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not belong to that Seventy-eight Club.

Mr. RANKIN. He had written this book on One Man Willkie, exposing the corruption of the Philadelphia convention in 1940. He was invited to come down here and address you Republican Congressmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not me. They will not let me in.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman was getting in by invitation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right; but I did not have an invitation.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, for some mysterious reason, they have canceled this invitation. I say, whenever we attempt to help you clean house, you run out on us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not run out on you. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I will get hold of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBY] and I will speak to him about it, and I will ask him to pray over that situation

and search his conscience and see if he cannot have that man down there. But you know that while those fellows came in later years, they are now getting some of our habits. They have been here, and they get frightened at the cars, as we say, and they may back up once in a long time. But they are just backing up to get started to go up the grade.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I suggest the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Rowe] the chairman of the Seventy-eight Club.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. This colloquy does afford us some mirth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is a lot of instruction in it, too, as you will find if you will just listen carefully.

Mr. ROWE. I think I have, very carefully. I want to come to this rather serious point, that this thing is too serious to treat lightly. I think we ought to give the gentleman responsible for that statement in the paper yesterday the opportunity of appearing before a committee of this Congress and explaining why it was made, and from what source he got his authority. I think it is a good subject for an investigation, and I should like to see some of the older Members of the House see that that is brought to investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. That is a good suggestion, too. But I have tried to talk to inmates of a home for the feeble-minded and to people in asylums and I never got anywhere with them. I do not know where we would get by calling that professor. He is just that way. What are you going to do about him?

Mr. RAMEY. The tragedy of it is that these hard-working taxpayers of Ohio are paying taxes to support this so-called expert while their own sons are fighting to save us from such grotesque dictatorship.

Mr. ROWE. The serious thing about that is that if a person like that can make this sort of a statement, casting an aspersion on what I consider to be sturdy Americans, and there is included with it that in the House we are amused by the statement, for the great part it only encourages them to continue. I think something should be done to cause them to stop it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is amusing, also absurd, also unfortunate, that anyone would give such advice, but after our people's experience with the new dealers we do not expect common sense nor sound judgment from them. I have been trying for 8 years to get these birds out. I expect to continue to try. I hope that that club of the gentleman's will keep on, and will get this man down here to tell them about Willkie and what Willkie is doing so that everybody can know. Then we can all get together and join the gentleman from Mississippi and kick the whole outfit of new dealers and Communists off the Federal pay roll.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the United States Marine Corps lost a commandant through retirement and also last week the Marine Corps accepted a new commandant. I, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, having known the retiring commandant for many years, want to pay tribute to him on the floor of the House. General Holcomb has served the Marines well. He has lived up to all the traditions and the history of the Marine Corps. He has been a fine commandant in the most trying times of our military history. He retired only because he had reached the age when he thought he should retire.

The only consolation the Nation has in the retirement of General Holcomb is that the new commandant will carry on. He is one of our great heroes of this war, Lieutenant General Vandegrift.

I think this House should pay tribute to one who is not only a fine gentleman but who is, in every sense of the word, a United States Marine, General Holcomb.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial on General Holcomb.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

TOUGH, QUIET—THAT'S THE OFFICER CODE OF MARINE CORPS UNDER HOLCOMB, RETIRING LEADER

(By John G. Norris)

One of the bloodiest battles in United States history has been won only because the men of America's amphibious "elite corps" knew how to fight and how to die.

Lesser troops probably would have failed at Tarawa. Those American marines won. They had what it took—high courage, perfect discipline, the know-how of landing operations, and the will to win.

Wake Island, Guadalcanal, and Bougainville also are evidence of the topnotch fighting ability of the corps.

What makes them so good?

TRADITION IMPORTANT

Tradition, say marine old-timers, has a great deal to do with it. Marines have fought in every war the United States has waged, and in numerous expeditions and campaigns in between. Down through the years a Marine Corps tradition has grown up which every leatherneck feels is his personal responsibility to carry on.

This has produced two things, a very high esprit and a corps of professional soldiers—noncom as well as officers—which has maintained a continuity of training technique and combat skill. Marine training today emphasizes two things, as it has for many years—marksmanship and the initiative of both the leader and the individual soldier.

But though the fighting ability of the marines thus is the work of many men through many generations, there is one man today who has had a very great deal to do

with the success of the corps in this war. He took a good weapon and with the help of aides made it very much better.

That man is Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, commandant of marines for the past 7 years.

Because of his innate modesty and dislike of the limelight, few outside the corps know much about stocky, bespectacled Tommy Holcomb.

HE SET THE EXAMPLE

It took an announcement of his impending retirement last week to focus attention on the great job he has done as marine commandant. Holcomb not only has expanded his corps twentyfold, without lowering its spirit and fighting skill, but has exercised considerable personal influence on the service as well.

The latter was not through the force of a colorful personality, for General Holcomb is not colorful.

It has rather been through example and precept, and his selection of leaders.

Although he makes few public speeches, the marine boss makes it a point to address the graduating classes of the corps basic schools whenever he can. In such talks he set forth his ideas of what a marine leader should be—a concept which differs considerably from many people's ideas of military commanders.

Speak softly, he advises newly commissioned second lieutenants. Wear your bars with courage, with intelligence, and with due humility, practice self-control, and avoid swashbuckling and loud talk, he counsels. You must be tough, Holcomb says, but adds: "Tough does not mean bully or swaggering braggart."

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

General Holcomb's remarks on leadership before a group of Quantico graduates last September 22, in fact, are so well stated and expressive of the need of high character in military leaders that we quote them at some length.

"We must have men," says Holcomb, "who feel a sense of responsibility to their country, a sense of responsibility which makes them willing to take chances to risk their lives if necessary, in dangerous and different tasks.

"We must have men who want to learn; men who realize that discipline is essential for the best results, who recognize they have a responsibility to the men under them as well as to those above them. We must have men who realize that teamwork is important, that it pays dividends. And finally, we must have men who realize that they must cultivate ingenuity, inventiveness for the occasion when those qualities are required.

"A marine, you see, is therefore a man who disciplines himself and accepts discipline from others when required. He is a man who has practiced and learned self-control.

"Some of the best marines I have known are soft-spoken, quiet men. These are usually the qualities of the men with the most resolve and the most courage. Loud talkers are often those of little control, often the indication of an inferiority."

Holcomb emphasizes that leadership depends to a large extent on experience:

"With the proper character and this training you will gain confidence—and confidence you must have—confidence, not cockiness, and confidence comes from knowing how to do your job. It comes from training, from experience—it comes only from the hard way.

"You officers will be leaders in our future operations. Leadership is not easy, is not automatic. You must be possessed of those qualities of leadership which command respect and loyalty—which inspire in all hands the determination, and more important, the compelling desire to work together for a common end."

MANY ADVANCES

But General Holcomb's contribution and influence on the Marine Corps has not been alone in the field of developing better leadership. During his regime as commandant, many notable advances have been made in tactics, organization, and weapons of amphibious operations—that all-important phase of the present war and the marines' particular specialty.

Before the war, General Holcomb had difficulty convincing many ranking military and naval officers and others in official life of the vital importance of amphibious forces in American war plans.

Back in 1937 he argued that we would have to seize advance bases in the Pacific in the event of hostilities, and therefore should have adequate forces trained in this most difficult of operations.

Even after Pearl Harbor, it was some time before the Army launched a large amphibious training program.

But all the while, the marines under Holcomb's direction were perfecting the technique of landing operations, adapting modern weapons to their long-time specialty, and preparing a nucleus of highly trained troops in such tactics.

Perhaps the major achievement in this field was the publication, for the first time in history, of the first exhaustive and authoritative text on amphibious operations.

This official textbook on landing operations was largely prepared at the Marine Corps School at Quantico, Va., during 1935-36, while Holcomb was its director and finally issued in 1938, when he was commandant.

Kept up to date with the latest lessons from the war fronts, this document has been the bible of all Allied amphibious operations in the war.

"ALLIGATOR" PAYS OFF

Perhaps the most important amphibious weapon of modern days—the "alligator"—was developed and perfected during Holcomb's regime. This amphibious tractor—capable of carrying troops on both land and water, proved its worth a hundredfold at Tarawa. The "alligators" were able to reach the beach when the landing barges got stuck on the coral reefs.

Marine Corps aviation—with pilots and planes skilled and adapted to both carrier and land-based operations and specializing in covering and supplying landings—was greatly expanded during Holcomb's time.

The Marine Corps underwent a thoroughgoing reorganization during the past 7 years.

In prior years, the largest Leatherneck unit was a brigade. The first marine division was created under Holcomb—a self-contained fighting force combining power in landing attack with seaborne mobility. There are now four, soon will be five.

Another type of marine unit was also developed during this time. It was the defense battalion, a fighting force with carefully balanced artillery and antiaircraft support, especially designed for protecting a small island. One of these battalions stood off overwhelming Jap forces attacking Wake Island for weeks in December 1941, sinking seven enemy warships. Another held Midway Island.

During his tenure as commandant, General Holcomb has believed in bringing up younger men to positions of high command. He has strictly enforced the age retirement rule and when he reached the normal retiring age for generals—64—applied it to himself, even though fit and excepted under the law.

This successor—Lt. Gen. Alexander Archer Vandegrift, the hero of Guadalcanal—is cut from the same cloth. Vandegrift was General Holcomb's own choice to carry on in the job and fits exactly into the retiring commandant's definition of the ideal marine officer.

Holcomb, moreover, is not going on the shelf. Secretary Knox said last week that he will return to service soon. What his new post will be was not disclosed, but an amphibious expert of his caliber will certainly be invaluable in the high command during this amphibious war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement concerning the case of Jersey City and the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be an open meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 2001, relating to penalty mail, at which time the Postmaster General and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or their representatives, will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, for consideration of a post-war bill, to be held in room 217, Old House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges; with amendment (Rept. No. 934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2973. A bill to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to

any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution; with amendment (Rept. No. 935). Referred to the House calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3241. A bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 80. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; without amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the investigation of certain transactions of the Tampa Shipbuilding Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 3784. A bill to promote the sale of United States Savings bonds by means of a premium plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3785. A bill to provide for crop insurance on a self-sustaining premium payment basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3786. A bill to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce and to safeguard the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3787. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 202 (by request). Joint resolution providing compensation for per diem employees for December 25, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution declaring the American post-war economic policy of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 374. Resolution requesting certain information from the President with respect to veterans' care and rehabilitation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3788. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3789. A bill for the relief of Jack Williams and Mrs. Lora Sally Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3790. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Knight Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 3791. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 3792. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Cross to John F. Haller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 3793. A bill granting a pension to Frances Leonard Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3894. By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas: Petition of J. F. Schenck and 201 others, of Hays, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3895. Also, petition of George Lipp and 43 others, of Park, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3896. Also, petition of John J. Zelgler and 44 others, of Collyer, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3897. Also, petition of George Deger and 135 others, of Grainfield, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3898. Also, petition of Earl Smith and 28 others, of Quinter, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3899. Also, petition of Paul Depperschmidt and 42 others, of Park, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3900. Also, petition of Carl Schaible and Roy Richardson and 186 others, of Oakley, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3901. Also, petition of William Gibbs and 158 others, of Plainville, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3902. Also, petition of D. O. Tate and 35 others, of Luray, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3903. Also, petition of Dave Dumler and 26 others, of Russell, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3904. Also, petition of Joe M. Drelling and 89 others, of Victoria, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3905. Also, petition of H. V. Bird and 44 others, of Lucas, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3906. Also, petition of J. H. Miller and 24 others, of Natoma, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3907. Also, petition of J. F. Wiesner and 74 others, of Ellis, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3908. Also, petition of S. W. Selbe and 88 others, of Wakeeney, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3909. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition favoring the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3910. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Joseph Keim and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3911. Also, petition of John Mebes and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks

to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3912. Also, petition of Walter Russell and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3913. Also, petition of Arthur E. Bach and 21 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3914. Also, petition of Mrs. E. McLaughlin and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3915. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by Isaac Donen, president of the Board of Trade and 368 citizens of Rye, N. Y., urging the Congress to enact legislation to provide fair and equitable control of prices at the farm level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3916. Also (by request): Petition signed by Thomas F. Garvey and other residents of New Rochelle, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3917. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 19 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3918. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of G. A. Holden and 25 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise and request Congress to vote against such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3919. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Hair and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3920. Also, petition of Jean S. Fennell and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3921. Also, petition of Mike Oftedahl and 25 other residents of Spokane, Wash., expressing approval of VITO MARCANTONIO's bill (H. R. 1732); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3922. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Otto Emrich, of Norfolk, Nebr., and 92 other citizens of Norfolk, Wisner, Carroll, Wayne, Winside, Foster, Randolph, Pierce, Osmond, Enola, Hoskins, Bloomfield, Battle Creek, Clarkson, Tilden, Oakdale, Pilger, Madison, Leigh, Stanton, Meadow Grove, Beemer, West Point, and Petersburg, Nebr., citing existing ceiling prices on hogs and proposed ceiling prices on cattle as detrimental to the livestock industry and productive of curtailment in the production of livestock, and urging immediate relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3923. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Dama Holden, of Monterey Park, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3924. Also, petition of Eleanor Mandella, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 11 others, urging the

passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3925. Also, petition of Mrs. Daniel Marolin, of Alhambra, Calif., and 10 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3926. Also, petition of Eva C. Moran, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3927. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Guadalupe Parlor, No. 231, urging that all the war relocation centers be placed under the control of the United States Army for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3928. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Independent American Labor Party Club of Mount Vernon, N. Y., urging the formation of a House interracial affairs committee; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we lift lame yet pleading hands before the throne of Thy grace. As we come in the fresh mercies of another morning, purge our minds, we beseech Thee, on this day of bitter national remembrance. With scarred memories that dim our eyes and strangely stir our hearts, deliver us from evil—the evil of vows of vengeance which would stain our very souls, from the evil of a festering hatred which would poison our inner life. May we rather be sobered as we see perfidy and malice revealed as the deadliest explosives in Thy universe, blasting the very kingdoms which seize them as weapons. May we search our own hearts and repent of our own sins as we read the fiery letters of Thy righteous sentence against all aggressors: Thy kingdom of blood and plunder shall be divided and given to another.

In this day of destiny when the hammers of Thy purpose are beating out new shapes on the anvil of the world, may this dear land of ours not be weighed in the balances and found wanting. Fashion in us a mind forgetful of past ill will, a heart of forgiving love for true spirits in all nations, and a ruling passion to find a way of global concord in the flaming dawn of a warless world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that on November 28, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

LXXXIX—652

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy."

TEHERAN CONFERENCE DECLARATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the declaration of the three powers issued from Teheran on yesterday afternoon, embodying the statement issued by the heads of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The declaration is as follows:

We, the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these 4 days past in this the capital of our ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.

We express our determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow.

As to war, our military staffs have joined in our round-table discussions, and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations to be undertaken from the East, West, and South.

The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

And as to peace, we are sure that our concord will win an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers, we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression, and intolerance. We will welcome them, as they may choose to come, into a world family of democratic nations.

No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea, and their war plants from the air.

Our attack will be relentless and increasing.

Emerging from these cordial conferences, we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose.

Signed: Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.
Signed at Teheran, December 1, 1943.

NOTICE OF THE EXHIBITION OF THE PICTURE "VICTORY THROUGH AIR POWER"

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I give notice that on Friday of this week, at 4

o'clock p. m., in the caucus room there will be exhibited a very interesting picture entitled "Victory Through Air Power." The picture is produced by Mr. Disney, and is sponsored by Major de Seversky. The picture deals with the subject of the power of air facilities to win the war. It is hoped that Senators and their respective staffs may find it convenient to come to the caucus room and enjoy the picture.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1315) providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2232. An act to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3449. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

FREDERICK RODIEK, ANCILLARY EXECUTOR OF THE WILL OF JOHN F. HACKFLED, DECEASED, AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 136)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, in accordance with Senate Resolution 229, Seventy-third Congress, a certified copy